The University of Chicago

THE PREACHING OF PETER: THE BEGINNING OF CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT AND EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE
IN THE GRADUATE DIVINITY SCHOOL

16,508

BY

JOSEPH NICHOLAS REAGAN

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
BS
2960
.P6
R42
1923
16,508

2.39.1
R22

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
16,508

COPYRIGHT 1923 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

All Rights Reserved

Published June 1923

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

PREFACE

The present study was suggested to the writer by a remark of Professor Edgar Johnson Goodspeed during a course of lectures at the University of Chicago last summer. Professor Goodspeed said that were he to edit again "The Oldest Christian Apologists," he would give the first place to "The Preaching of Peter."

Much had been written on the subject, but, as the study progressed, the problem seemed still unsolved: Was the Preaching older than some other known apologies? Was it really more of an apology than some of the canonical books of the New Testament? Indeed, Professor Goodspeed himself, in his *Story of the New Testament* (p. 57), had called Matthew's Gospel "the first historic apology for universal Christianity," and E. F. Scott had written a book on *The Apologetic of the New Testament* (1907). This involved the present writer in the difficulty of determining precisely the nature of apologetic in early Christianity and of investigating its beginnings.

The investigation was fascinating, especially in the somewhat untouched questions of the relation of Christian Apologetic to Jewish and heathen. To determine what "The Preaching of Peter" really was; its relation to other writings of "Peter"; its date and place of origin; the sources of its material; the reason for such selection; and to see what advantage the light thus shed might afford in the study of Christian origins—all this seemed a task worth while. But the material to be handled was enormous, and keenly felt was the desideratum long before recognized by Paul Wendland: "Es waere sehr wuenschenswert, dass die apologetischen und polemischen Gedanken der juedisch-hellenistichen Litteratur einmal gesammelt wuerden, damit wir deren Einfluss auf die altchristliche Apologetik ermessen Koennten."[1] However, as an important part of the study was to determine to what class of literature the Preaching belonged, as well as the time and place of its provenance, it seemed at all events advisable to go through the literature of several centuries preceding the appearance of the Preaching in Clement of Alexandria's *Stromateis*, that is from about 200 B.C. to 200 A.D., and note what in any way resembled the known fragments in thought or

[1] Paul Wendland, "Die Therapeuten," *Jahrbuecher fuer classische Theologie*, XXII, Suppl. (Leipzig, 1896), p. 708.

language. The question of chronology of such significant sources as, for instance, the Hermetic Literature, however important in itself, has not been discussed here, when it could be reasonably concluded from the investigation of scholars that the source in question was at least prior to the year 100 A.D. Of later literature, the Clementine and the Barlaam and Joasaph romance, the Sacra Parallela and the Pseudo-Cyprian treatises, as well as Eusebius and the apologists, have contributed much material of value, but whether the use made of the Preaching by these was at first or second hand could not always be determined.

While none of the fragments which it has been thought might belong to the Preaching could well be ignored, and while much has necessarily been said about the beginnings of Christian apologetic, the one purpose of the present study was to determine the Preaching's place in literature, and the writer has tried to present the work which convinced him that the Preaching of Peter is the oldest known Christian apology.

He acknowledges his great indebtedness to the scholars whose previous work upon the Preaching he has so freely used, especially Hilgenfeld, J. A. Robinson, E. von Dobschuetz, and J. Geffcken.

It was particularly to the living problems with which the early Christian apologists had to deal, that the writer has given his attention; and it is here especially, in getting a view of those problems in the light of their own day, that he acknowledges with pleasure and gratitude his indebtedness to Professor Shirley Jackson Case, without whose kind encouragement and valuable suggestions the work could scarce have been completed.

Finally, the writer wishes to express his grateful appreciation of the many valuable suggestions and kind criticisms and indispensable assistance received from Professor Ernest De Witt Burton and Professor Edgar Johnson Goodspeed, with whom it has been the writer's good fortune and pleasure to be able frequently to confer in the writing of this dissertation.

The readers into whose hands this dissertation may fall, while criticizing it as the interests of thorough scholarship and justice may demand, will, it is hoped, be mindful of the difficulties under which work of this kind during war times is laboring.

JOSEPH NICHOLAS REAGAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
May 1, 1921

CONTENTS

PAGE

Abbreviations ix

I. Introduction: Previous Study of the Preaching . . . 1

II. The Preaching's Place in Literature 8

III. The Beginnings of Christian Apologetic 47

IV. Commentary on the Fragments 60
The Name. Relation of the Preaching to Other Petrine Writings. Other Possible Fragments. Date. Place of Writing.

Index 83

ABBREVIATIONS FREQUENTLY USED

A.A.—*Die aeltesten Apologeten*, E. J. Goodspeed, Goettingen, 1914; the text of Aristides, Justin, Tatian, Melito, and Athenagoras, unless otherwise indicated.

Apoc.—Apocalypse of John, or Revelation.

Apol.—*Apology.*

Arnim—Joannes Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, I (05), II (03), III (03).

Bousset—W. Bousset, *Juedisch-Christlischer Schultrieb in Alexandria und Rom*, 1915.

Charles—R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, I–II, 1913.

Clem. *Strom.* or *Ecl. Proph.*—Clement of Alexandria's *Stromateis* or *Eclogae Prophetarum*, ed. Staehlin, I (05), II (06), III (09).

Clem. *H.R.*—The Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions.*

Dial.—Justin's *Dialogue with the Jew Trypho*, Goodspeed, *Die aelt. Apol.*

Dob.—Ernst von Dobschuetz, "Das Kerygma Petri kritisch untersucht," in *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, herausgegeben von Harnack und Gebhardt, Leipzig, XI, 1 (1894), pp. 1–162.

Euseb. *H.E.*—Hieronymi Eusebii *Historia Ecclesiastica.*

G.A.L.—*Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, of Bardenhewer, Harnack, etc.

Her. Cor.—*Hermetic Literature Corpus* (Parthy, *Hermetis Trism. Poem.*, 1854).

Jo.—John, the Fourth Gospel; I Jo. II Jo. III Jo.—The Epistles of John.

J.C.P.—*Jahrbücher für classische Philologie.*

K.P.—Kerygma Petrou—The Preaching of Peter.

L.—Luke, the Third Gospel.

Mk.—Mark, the Second Gospel.

Mt.—Matthew, the First Gospel.

P.G., P.L.—Migne, *Patrologia Graeca, Patrologia Latina.*

N.T.—New Testament.

O.T.—Old Testament.

T.L.Z.—*Theologische Literatur Zeitung.*

T.U.—*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Gebhardt-Harnack, Schmidt-Harnack, Leipzig.

T.S.—*Texts and Studies*, J. A. Robinson, Cambridge.

Zahn *For.*—Theodor Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Ntl. Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Leipzig.

G.N.T.K.—Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons: I. Das Neue Testament vor Origines*, Leipzig, 1887–1889. *II. Urkunden und Beilage zum ersten und dritten Band*, Leipzig, 1890–1892.

Z.W.T.—*Zeitschrift fuer wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Leipzig.

I

INTRODUCTION: PREVIOUS STUDY OF THE PREACHING

The Preaching of Peter is quoted, evidently with belief that it is genuine Scripture, by Clement of Alexandria[1] in his *Stromateis*, or *Miscellanies*, that veritable mine of traditional Christian teaching of the Alexandrine School, gathered and put to writing about the year 200 A.D.

I. In the Preaching of Peter you may find the Lord called "Law and Logos" [*Strom.* i. 29. 182]. Peter (in the Preaching) calls the Lord "Logos and Law" [*ibid.* ii. 15. 68]. "Law and Logos" the Savior himself is called, as Peter (in the Preaching) says [*Ecl. Proph.* 58].

II. Peter says in the Preaching: "Know therefore that there is one God, who made the Beginning (arche) of all things and has control over their destiny. . . . . He is unseen, Who sees all things; immovable, Who moves all things; He needs nothing, Whom all things need and by Whom they exist; He is unchangeable, eternal, immortal; uncreated, Who created all things by the Word (Logos) of His Power (Dynamis), that is, according to Gnostic Writings, the Son" [*Strom.* vi. 5. 39].

III. Then he adds: "Worship (this) God, not as the Greeks . . . . for they, led astray by ignorance, not knowing God as we do, according to perfect knowledge, making images of those things, the dominion of which He gave them for their use—wood and stone, copper and iron, gold and silver—changing them from their (material) nature and use as things for service, they set them up and worship them; and those things which God gave them for food—the fowls of the air and swimming things of the sea and creeping things of the earth and wild beasts and fourfooted cattle of the field, weasels also and mice, cats also and dogs and apes, even to these, their eatables, they offer eatables as sacrifices, setting dead things before the dead as gods; they are ungrateful to God, denying by these actions that He exists" [*ibid.*].

IV. Again he will continue thus to show how: "Neither shall you worship as do the Jews, for they too, though they think they alone know God, have not experienced Him, but worship angels and archangels, month and moon; and unless the moon appears they do not keep the Sabbath which is called 'first,' nor keep 'new-moon,' nor 'azymes,' nor 'feast,' nor 'great day'" [*ibid.* 5. 41].

V. Then he goes on to say: "As you have learned holily and justly, what we have delivered to you, keep. Worship God in a new way through Christ;

[1] Unless otherwise indicated, the edition used in this dissertation is Otto Stählin, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, Leipzig, 1905–9.

for we have found in the Scriptures how the Lord says: 'Behold I make with you a New Covenant, not such as I made with your fathers on Mount Horeb, a New Covenant I make with you: for those of the (Heathen) Greeks and Jews are grown old (palaia); but we, after a new manner, as a third race, worship God as Christians'" [*ibid.*].

VI. Wherefore Peter says the Lord said to the Apostles: "If therefore any one of Israel will, having repented, believe in God through my name, his sins shall be forgiven him. But after twelve years go out into the world, lest any one say, 'we did not hear' . . . ." [*ibid.* 5. 43].

VII. In the Preaching of Peter, the Lord says to his disciples after the Resurrection: "I chose you twelve disciples, judging you to be worthy of me, (you) whom the Lord desired; having deemed you faithful Apostles, sending you into the world to evangelize men throughout the universe, to know that there is one God through the faith of the Christ, (which is) mine, making plain what is to come to pass, so that those who hear and believe may be saved; but those who having heard do not believe, may bear witness that they have no excuse to say: 'we did not hear'" [*ibid.* 6. 48].

VIII. Again he says to all rational souls: "Whatsoever any one of you did in ignorance, not knowing God aright, if he, having learned to know, repent, all his sins will be forgiven him" [*ibid.*].

IX. Wherefore Peter also in the Preaching, speaking of the Apostles, says: "We indeed opening the books we have of the Prophets have found those things which (are said) in parables, and those in enigmas, and those openly and explicitly calling Jesus the Christ; we find also his manifestation (parousia) and death, and his cross, and all the other sufferings which the Jews inflicted on him, and the Resurrection (egersis) and Assumption (analēpsis) into heaven, to have been done before Jerusalem, as it had been written it was fitting that he should suffer, and what should come to pass after him. Therefore, having learned these things we believed God on account of what had been written of him" [*ibid.* 15. 148].

X. And after a few words he goes on again showing that the prophecies came to pass according to divine Providence thus: "For we knew that God truly ordained these things, and we say nothing without Scripture (proof)" [*ibid.*].

Origen,[1] Clement's successor at the Alexandrine School, refers to the Preaching in the following way:

Now the words of Heracleon are often repeated, quoting from (the work) entitled the Preaching of Peter, and it is proposed to make a careful investigation also concerning that little book, whether it be genuine or spurious or mixt; therefore we rather pass it by (for the present) with this one remark that, as it is said, Peter taught, "you should not worship God as do the Greeks,

[1] A. E. Brooke, *The Commentary of Origen on S. John's Gospel*, I (Cambridge, 1896), 264.

taking material things and adoring wood and stone; nor worship God as do the Jews, for they too thinking they alone know God, do not know Him, but adore angels and month and moon" [*Com. in Jo.*, XIII, 17. Cf. Frag. XI (p. 73, n. 1)].

There are several other passages which have been thought by some to belong to the Preaching of Peter, but owing to confusion of titles, due partly to translation, there is considerable discussion concerning the possible identity of The Preaching of Peter with The Teaching of Peter, The Sermons of Peter, The Preaching of Peter and Paul, and the like. These and other more or less doubtful fragments will be considered in chapter iv.

It is strange that a work of such value in remote Christian antiquity claiming and acknowledged to be from the Prince of the Apostles should have been allowed to perish. Origen's disparaging remark may suggest the explanation. Even though he intended but to check up Heracleon's Scripture authorities and refuse to acknowledge the Preaching as an authentic work of Peter, his words connote more than this: the Preaching had been used by the Valentinian Gnostic Heracleon, and may on this account have been rejected with Gnostic writings *in globo*. Apparently it was also in favor with the party which produced the Clementine literature, and its remnants are unmistakably discernable in the *Homilies* and *Recognitions*.[1] Eusebius[2] followed Origen, of course, not only in rejecting the Preaching but incredibly minimizing the value and popularity of all the writings current under Peter's name, except the first Epistle. Jerome,[3] or whoever wrote *De viris illustribus*, is here as elsewhere only a faulty copyist of Eusebius.

The content of the Preaching was absorbed by the second-century apologists, and shared the fate of Quadratus and others that perished. With the *Apology* of Aristides, it seems, it crept into the Barlaam and Joasaph[4] romance, written probably in the seventh century. Be this

[1] M. H. Waitz, "Die Pseudoclementinen Homilien und Rekognitionen," *T.U.*, XXV (Leipzig, 1904), 4.

[2] Euseb. *H.E.* iii. 3. 2.

[3] Hieron. *De Vir.* iii. 19; *Ep.* 70, *Ad Magnum* 4.

[4] The Barlaam and Joasaph romance, which had long been known in a Latin version of the works of S. John Damascene, and a Greek text, had been edited for the first time in Boissonade's *Anecdota Graeca*, IV (Paris, 1832), 1–365, and reprinted in Migne's *P.G.*, IV, No. 96 (Paris), 859–1240, which is the text here used, when, after the recovery of the *Apology* of Aristides in a Syriac translation in 1889, it was observed by J. A. Robinson to contain that apology in Greek. Geffcken, *Zwei griech. Apol.*, p. 316, points several pages which may be taken from the Preaching of Peter. Bardenhewer, *G.A.L.*, I, 172 ff.; Krumbacher, *G.B.L.*², pp. 886–91.

as it may, the Preaching was all but forgotten till comparatively recent times when scholars recognized its superiority over the literature with which it had been classed and attempted to recover the fragments of the work of this evidently clear-minded, sober thinker of remote Christian antiquity.

Dodwell,[1] in his 1689 Oxford dissertation on Irenaeus, passingly alludes to Origen's mention of the Preaching. In 1700 Grabe[2] gathered the fragments with considerable completeness and commented on them. While not believing the Preaching a work of Peter, he thought it written shortly after Peter's death. Another century, however, was to pass with but brief mention of the Preaching by writers on the New Testament canon, till Kleuker[3] recognized the writer as a Greek Christian, not a Judaizer, as it had been thought, but mistook him for a partisan of the opposite extreme. Study of the Petrine[4] and Clementine Literature drew the attention of scholars to the Preaching, but they saw in it only another instance of partisan polemic. Credner[5] collected the texts and discussion of them up to 1832. Bleek[6] anticipated the present opinion when he characterized the "sog. Predigt des Petrus" as "eine apokryphische Schrift, die nach den erhaltenen Fragmenten einen tiefdenkenden alexandrinischen Heiden-christen muss zum Verfasser gehabt haben und deren Verlust gar sehr zu bedauern ist."

It was Hilgenfeld[7] that first with patient labor gathered the *disiecta membra* of the Preaching of Peter, judiciously discriminating between them and the remains of other apparently partisan polemic, arranged them in plausible order, and edited them with scholarly annotations in his *Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum*, in 1866, under the title of "Praedicatio Petri (et Pauli)." Besides the fragments from Clement and Origen, given above, Hilgenfeld included passages from St. Gregory Naz. *Orations*, Oecumenius' *Commentary on James*, *Sacra*

[1] Dodwell, *Dissertationes in Irenaeum*, VI (Oxon., 1689), 10–11.

[2] Grabe, *Spicilegium patrum*, I (1700), 55 ff.

[3] Kleuker, *Apokryphen des Neuen Testaments* (1798), pp. 267 ff.

[4] E. T. Mayerhoff, *Historisch-critische Einleitung in die Petrinische Schriften* (1835), pp. 304–18; Schliemann, *Die Clementinen nebst den verwandten Schriften und der Ebionitismus der ersten Jahrhunderte* (Hamburg, 1844), pp. 253–64.

[5] Credner, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften*, I (1832), 348 ff.

[6] Bleek, "Ueber die Entstehung und Zusammensetzung der . . . . Sibyllinischer Orakel," in *De Welte* and *Lueckes Theologische Zeitschrift*, I (1849), 144.

[7] Hilgenfeld, *Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum*, fasc. IV (2d ed., 1884), pp. 51–65.

Parallela, *Acta Petri et Pauli*, the Pseudo-Cyprian treatise *De rebaptismate*, and Lactantius *Inst. div.* (iv. 21), which will be discussed below, chapter iv. He thought the Preaching of Peter had been added to the Lucan Acts of the Apostles as a "Third Treatise" (cf. Acts 1:1).[1] J. A. Robinson,[2] in an appendix to J. Rendel Harris' edition of the *Apology* of Aristides, discussed the relation of the Preaching to that apology, but with too great eagerness to find in it what he wished to prove apostolic.[3] Theodor Zahn,[4] while exhaustively commenting on the canonicity of the Preaching, at first (in 1889) admitted and then (in 1892) rejected Hilgenfeld's hypothesis of "The Preaching of Peter (and Paul)." Zahn derives all this Pauline material from the Acts of Paul.[5] A. Harnack,[6] with characteristic acumen and brevity, gives the Preaching fragments nearly as Hilgenfeld had given them, though not allowing the authenticity of all. Harnack's remark[7] that the five old Petrine writings should be critically studied induced E. von Dobschuetz[8] to make a thorough, scholarly investigation of the Preaching of Peter, commenting on the fragments and the literary discussion of them up to his writing in 1893. He admits that the fragments quoted by Clement and Origen under the name "Preaching of Peter" really belong to it! Of the other fragments, he thinks the "Petri Doctrine" and the "libellus" quoted by Origen to be probably the same as "Kerygma Petri"; the passage from Origen's *Homily X on Leviticus*, he thinks, may ("moeglich") belong to the Preaching; the passage from Optatus

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 57: "Quemadmodum Petri Kerygma iudaizans Petri Periodois augebatur, ita etiam Actis Apostolorum canonicis vel Lucae deutero logo (Act. 1:1) Petri (Pauli) Kerygma additum esse videtur, tanquam tertius logos, qui Petrum et Paulum una Romae docuisse vel praedicasse et simul martyrio coronatos esse narravit."

[2] *The Apology of Aristides*, by J. Rendel Harris, Cambridge, 1891; 2d ed., *T.S.*, I, 1 (1893), pp. 86–99.

[3] See his remarks on a similar occasion, *The Gospel According to Peter* (1892), p. 33: "And so the new facts are just what they should be, if the church's universal tradition as to the supreme and unique position of the Four Canonical Gospels is still to be sustained by historical criticism."

[4] Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, II, 2 (1892), pp. 820–32.

[5] *Ibid.*, II, 2, p. 879; cf. pp. 827, 884 f.

[6] A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, I (1893), 25–28.

[7] *T.U.*, IX, 2 (1893), III, p. 78 f.: "Die fuenf alten Schriften, die den des Name Petrus tragen (I. Brief, II. Brief, Evangelien, Apokalypse, Kerygma), sind auf Grunde des neuen Fundes eine zusammenhaengenden Untersuchung zu unterziehen," u.s.w.

[8] E. von Dobschuetz, "Das Kerygma Petri kritisch untersucht," *T.U.*, XI (Leipzig, 1893), 1.

de schism, Donat. i. 5, he says, "als sehr zweifelhaft bezeichnet werden musste" (p. 134); "was in §§ 8–10 folgt (*Strom.* vi. 5. 42 f., Pseudo-Cyp. *De rebap.* 17; Lact. *Inst. Div.* iv. 21) erweist sich auch durch innere Gruende als dem K.P. fremd"; and ascribes the "Didaskalia" to Peter of Alexandria. While reasonably objecting to some of Robinson's hasty conclusions, Dobschuetz rather destructively controverted the results of Hilgenfeld's painstaking work, and would discouragingly put a forbidding seal upon the problems of the K.P. after it had been by himself "kritish untersucht," thus setting constructive study of the Preaching back two centuries. Happily, however, Dobschuetz' too rigorous "Kritik" did not prevail, and, as Hilgenfeld observed in his scholarly criticism,[1] Dobschuetz, decoyed by predilection for dogmatic definitiveness, had practically left the problem where he had found it. Hilgenfeld had edited the fragments under the title of "The Preaching of Peter (and Paul)," the addition "of Paul" being due to the occurrence of that name in one of Clement's citations of the Preaching. Dobschuetz (p. 126) disagrees with both Zahn and Hilgenfeld and postulates a "Preaching of Paul." Hilgenfeld points out the unlikeliness of Dobschuetz' contention that Gregory of Nazianzus should have quoted the words of a contemporary, Peter of Alexandria, as "the marvelous teaching of Peter," and reminds Dobschuetz of his own admission that the words "of Alexandria" had crept into the manuscript from a marginal gloss, and that there was nothing in the life of Peter of Alexandria which would render appropriate to him the allusion to "a weeping soul," as there was in the apostle Peter's denial of Jesus (Mk. 14:72). Hilgenfeld had found in the treatise *De rebaptismate* mention of a "confictus liber qui inscribitur Pauli praedicatio," and identified it with Clement's reference to "the apostle Paul in the Preaching of Peter" (*Strom.* vi. 6. 43), but thought the saying, "I am not an incorporeal demon," to be taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Dobschuetz (pp. 68 f.) contended that the K.P. was related rather to the Gospel of Mark in somewhat the same way as the Acts of the Apostles is to Luke's Gospel. He bases this hypothesis on the agreement of the two documents in point of literary style. We will return to this point in chapter iv, when considering the Petrine-Mark tradition. E. Preuschen,[2] in his Antilegomena, gives the fragments found in Clement and Origen and translates them into German without comment.

[1] *Z.W.T.*, I (1893), 518–41.

[2] Erwin Preuschen, *Antilegomena*², *Die Reste der ausserkanonischen Evangelien und urchristlichen Ueberlieferungen* (Giessen, 1905), pp. 88–91, 192–94.

The discussion aroused by the appearance of Aristides' *Apology* in 1890 threw helpful light upon the Preaching. Indirectly at least several works touching upon early Christian apologetic contributed toward a better understanding of its contents and sources. Wendland in his article on the Therapeutae, already referred to,[1] and his "Philo und die Kynisch-Stoische Diatribe," prepared material and invited further study. Collomp[2] and Bousset[3] more directly served our purpose in their investigation of the sources of Clement and the traditional teaching of the Alexandrine School. But perhaps the most helpful light has been shed upon the origin of early Christian apologetic by Geffcken[4] in his study of the two apologies of Aristides and of Athenagoras. He had been well fitted for such a task by his preparation of the *Sibylline Oracles*.[5] Nor should works like that of M. Friedlaender[6] be overlooked. But we shall have occasion to return to these later.

[1] Paul Wendland, *loc. cit.*

[2] Collomp, "Une Source de Clement d'Alexandrie et des Homelies Pseudo-Clementines," *Revue de philologie et de litterature et d'histoire anciennes*, XXXVII (Paris, 1913), 19–46.

[3] W. Bousset, *Juedisch-christlicher Schultrieb in Alexandria und Rom*, Goettingen, 1915.

[4] Johann Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, Leipzig, 1907.

[5] J. Geffcken, *Oracula Sibyllina*, Leipzig, 1902; cf. "Komposition und Entstehung der Oracula," *T.U.*, XXIII, 1.

[6] Moriz Friedlaender, *Geschichte der juedischen Apologetik als Vorgeschichte des Christentums*, Zuerich, 1913; cf. Case, *The Evolution of Early Christianity* (1920), pp. 93 f.

II

THE PREACHING'S PLACE IN LITERATURE

The Preaching's place in literature—its nature, date, provenance, destination—will best be determined by comparing the known fragments with similar thought and language in the literature from about 200 B.C. to 200 A.D.

Frag I. Edward Hicks,[1] in his *Traces of Greek Philosophy in the New Testament*, while apparently not thinking of this passage in the Preaching of Peter, very appositely remarks:

> As *logos* with St. John, so *nomos* with St. Paul is an oft-repeated and characteristic word, and helps us in the present inquiry. St. Paul does not confine its use to the Law of Moses; with him it is a much wider term, and sometimes almost personal. The word in its ambiguity and wider sense was common to the Greek and the Jewish world. In this way it was also itself a "trace" of the Greek Philosophy. With Philo there was not a wide distinction between the *logos* and the idea expressed in *nomos*. If the world was created by the *logos*, by the *logos* it was bound together, as by an all-embracing law [cf. I, 562].[2]

It would of course be preposterous to attempt to trace these two words through Greek and Jewish literature. A few references, however, are necessary here. Among the Jews, "the Law" meant more than "the Torah," or Mosaic Law. It was God's own eternal justice and mercy, goodness and truth. Not only was it the object of man's reverence and study, but of the contemplation and admiration of God himself. His "Word" made known his "Law" to men. As the "Word" was all but personified, the "Law" was all but adored. Once written down, the very writing became a most sacred object. Yet it was not the written words but that which those words revealed to man that was adorable. Man's highest hope was to understand and live according to God's Law. "All zeal for education in the family, the school, and the synagogue aimed at making the whole people a people of the Law."[3]

[1] Edward Hicks, *The Traces of Greek Philosophy and Roman Law in the New Testament* (London, 1896), p. 51.

[2] Unless otherwise indicated references are to *Philonis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt*, ed. L. Cohn et P. Wendland, Berolini, 1896–1915, I–VI.

[3] Emil Schuerer, *Geschichte des juedischen Volkes in Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, I–III⁴, Leipzig, 1901–9. English translation, II, 387.

The Prophets were believed to be sent principally in the interests of the Law. The very existence and perpetuation of the chosen people of God was first and most of all for the observance of the Law. If the Messiah was to come, he was to insure and propagate world-wide reverence and faithful keeping of the Law. All creation was for the manifestation of God's Law. Properly to understand and keep the Law was man's main business on earth, and to help him to understand and keep the Law was the *raison d'être* of the Jewish religious institution, the Priests, the Prophets, the Messiah. While the Law without the Prophets would have been unintelligible, the Prophets without the Law would never have been at all; all that was best was summed up in "the Law and the Prophets" (cf. Mt. 5:17; 7:12; 22:30; 28:19). The Golden Rule (Mt. 7:12; cf. Talmud, Sab. 30*b*), "the first and greatest commandment," would be appropriately personified in him who was the fulfilment of Jewish and Greek hope, as the Law and the Logos. Says Carl Schmidt:

> Der Schoepfer des Menschen ist zugleich der Offenbarer des goettlichen Heilswillens, der Uebermittler des natuerlichen Sittensgesetzes, wie es in der Entscheidung fuer Licht und Finsternis, Gut und Boese vorliegt. So war der Herr in der Zeit vor seiner Erscheinung der *nomos kai logos*, wie er im Kerygma Petri genannt wird, er war der *didaskalos*, dessen Lehre den Menschen seit Adam bekannt war. Und weil die Gebote Gottes resp. des Logos im A.T. schriftlich fixiert waren, konnte es bereits Glaeubige und Taeter der Gebote in der vorchristlichen Epoche geben.[1]

After commenting on the esteem in which the Jewish law was held in the first century A.D., Benn[2] remarks:

> Such assertions might be suspected of exaggeration, were they not, to a certain extent, confirmed by . . . . later writers . . . . showing that it was a common practice among the Romans to abstain from work on the Sabbath, and even to celebrate it by praying, fasting, and lighting lamps, to visit the synagogues, to study the law of Moses, and to pay the yearly contribution of two drachmas to the temple at Jerusalem.

Ovid, in his *Ars amatoriae* (i. 146), suggests the mental picture of a Roman girl frequenting the Jewish synagogue, attracted by the purity of the law, and the poet proceeds to instruct the lover how to break her constancy. Again, when the unfortunate lover is seeking a "remedium amoris" (219 f.) the poet encourages him to be faithful in frequent-

[1] Carl Schmidt, "Gespraeche Jesu mit seinen Juengern nach der Auferstehung (ein Katholisch-apostolisches Sendschreiben des 2. Jahrh.)," *T.U.*, XLIII (1919), 306 f.

[2] A. W. Benn, *The Greek Philosophers*[2] (London, 1914), p. 490.

ing the synagogue on the Sabbath, no matter how inclement the weather. Perseus (v. 180 ff.) contrasts the drunken festivities of the Roman Floralia with the more sober Jewish celebrations. Juvenal (*Sat.* xiv. 96 ff.) comments at length on the Romans learning the Jewish law, to the neglect of their own:

> Quidam sortiti metuentem Sabbata patrem.
> Nil praeter nubes et coeli numen adorant;
> Nec distare putant humana carne suillam,
> Sua pater abstinuit; mox et praeputia ponunt;
> Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges,
> *Judaicum ediscunt*, et *servant*, ac *metuunt jus*,
> Tradidit arcano quodcumque volumine Moses;
> Non monstrare vias, eadem nisi sacra colenti;
> Quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.

Horace, too, alludes to the commonness among the Romans of reverential, not to say scrupulous, fear of the Jewish law (*Sat.* i. 9. 61 ff.):

> Fuscus Aristius occurrit . . . . meliori
> Tempore dicam: hodie tricesima Sabbata: nin'
> Curtis Judaeis oppedere? Nulla mihi, inquam,
> Religio est.—At mi: sum paulo infirmior, unus
> Multorum; ignosces; alias loquar.—Hunccine solem
> Iam nigrum surrexe mihi! Fugit improbus, ac me
> Sub cultro linquit. Casu venit obvius illi
> Adversarius: et, Quotu, turpissime? magna
> Exclamat voce, et, hicci antestari? Ego vero
> Oppono auriculum: rapit jus: clamor utrinque:
> Undique concursus. Sic me servavit Apollo.

The *Sibyl*[1] (III, 255 ff.) portrays the Law given by God on Mt. Sinai for all peoples, but insists that all would go to ruin should Israel fail to keep it (III, 274 ff.). Cf. Ps. 119:92.

The "Law" "converts souls" (18:8); it is "truth" (119:142); "fountain of life" (Prov. 13:14); they who seek the Law will be replenlished by it (Sir. 32:19); they who love it will enjoy much peace (Ps. 119:165); the Law will go forth from Sion and the Logos from Jerusalem (Isa. 2:3; Mic. 4:2); it will be far off (Mic. 7:11); it will be torn to pieces, and the wicked will prevail (Hab. 1:4); the islands afar off are waiting for it (Isa. 42:4).

In the New Testament the Law is opposed to sin in almost personal conflict (cf. Rom. 5:20). Philo draws a strikingly similar contrast

[1] On the allegory of *Sib.*, III, 218 ff., 234–47, 573–95, see Friedlaender, pp. 49 ff.

(ii. 195). "The perfect law of liberty" (Jas. 1:25; cf. Gal. 5:14) had also been spoken of by Philo.[1] Rom. 10:4 seems to call Christ the "Perfect Law"; "The End of the Law is Christ." Gal. 3:24 makes "the Law a Pedagogue unto Christ." Heb. 10:1–10 seems to identify "the Law" with the one "who comes into the world to do God's will."

What the Law was to the Jews, Logos was to the Greeks. The Logos theory had supplanted nearly every other as an explanation of the universe. "Der Logos ist also nach den Bestimmungen . . . . das ewige Gesetz der Weltbewegung, wie sich diese in dem Streite, das heist dem Umfassen der Gegensaetze zeigt."[2] Logos with Heraclitus is both Nomos and Logos, creating and harmonizing the universe. Logos is also the principle of intelligent life in all men.[3]

Though Plato[4] and Aristotle make no mention of the Logos theory, it found its way into all the later schools of Greek philosophy, blended with Anaxagoras' *nous*, Plato's *idea*, and Aristotle's *physics*. According to the Stoics the cosmos is a living thing, and its life-principle is the Logos, though it is called nomos quite as frequently.[5] Not only did the Stoics commonly consider the Logos only one, but at times almost personified it, as the "Ruler," "King" of all things human and divine.[6]

[1] ii. 452; Hicks, *op. cit.*, p. 52; cf. Rom. 2:15.

[2] Max Heintze, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie* (Oldenberg, 1872), p. 16. He quotes (p. 18) Stobaeos (*Ecl.* i. 60) for a definition of Eimarmenē: "Logos ek tēs enantiodromias dēmiourgos tōn ontōn." This cosmic principle Heraclitus sometimes calls *diké* or *dikaion* (p. 23). "Fragen wir nun nach der eigentlichen und naechsten Bedeutung des Wortes Logos bei Heraklit, so könnte als solche: Rede, Ausspruch, oder Verhaeltniss, oder auch Vernunft angenommen werden" (p. 54). But we must not think Heraclitus' Logos mere immaterial thought. "So darf man sich den Logos nicht immateriall vorstellen, umgekehrt nichts materielles ohne diesen Logos, und wir muessen dennach dei Heraklit trotz seines Fortschrittes gegen die frueheren Philologen den reinsten Hylozoismus anerkennen, ebenso wie den reinsten Pantheismus, mag nun das Feuer als Gott betrachtet worden sein, wie wir bei Clemens (Cohort. 42 C) angeführt finden, oder der Logos, wie wir aus der Bezeichnung 'goettlicher Logos' bei Sextus schliessen koennen (Sextus *Math.* vii. 127 ff., 398 ff.)" (p. 27).

[3] Heraclitus apud Sext. *Math.* (Heintze, *op. cit.*, p. 55).

[4] According to Plato in one place (Diels, *Doxogr. graec.*, p. 323), "Eimarmenē" is "logos aidios kai nomos aidios."

[5] Cf. Cleanthes, *Hymn to Zeus* (Stob. *Ecl.* i. 1. 12; Arnim, *S.V.F.*, I, 537). Also Diog. Laert. vii. 88 (Arnim, I, 43), with which read Tertullian *Apol.* 21, and Lactantius *Inst. div.* i. 5. Minutius Felix summarizes it thus: "Zeno naturalem legem atque divinarum . . . . omnium esse principium" (*Octavius* 19. 10). The argument reoccurs frequently in Cicero's *De natura deorum.*

[6] Marcianus lib. I institut. (I, 11, 25, Mommsen; Arnim, I, 314).

The Logos is the source of spiritual power, of fate or providence, of intelligence and virtue in man, and of order and beauty in nature.[1] Indeed it identified nature and God. "Quid enim aliud est natura quam deus et divina ratio toti mundo partibusque eius inserta" (Seneca *De benef.* iv. 7. 1).

In the Hebrew Scriptures *the Word of the Lord* had been used in a way strikingly similar to the Greek use of *Logos*.[2] "And God said: Be light made" (Gen. 1:3). "The Word of the Lord came to Abraham" (Gen. 15:1). "Hear this word: . . . . the House of Israel is fallen" (Amos 5:1–8). "By the Word of the Lord were the heavens made" (Ps. 33:6). Cf. Isa. 55:11; Zach. 5:1–4; Ps. 106:20; Ps. 147:15. The Septuagint translated all such expressions by the Greek *Logos*. In rabbinical Hebrew, or Aramean, literature the words *memra* and *dibbur* are used as close synonyms of *Logos*. Quite generally the Targums render "the Lord" by "the Word of the Lord" wherever there is any implication of relation to the world which would seem incompatible with the Jewish concept of God. Thus Ps. 33:6 is rendered (in Tal. Mek. Beshallah): "The Holy One, blessed be He, created the world by the maamar." In the Targum on Gen. 7:16: "The *memra* brings Israel nigh unto God"; to Gen. 11:8: "The *memra* saved Noe from the flood"; to Isa. 56:13, it is the *memra* who will comfort Jerusalem "as one whom a mother caresseth"; to Zach. 12:5: "In the *memra* redemption will be found." So also in Jewish apocalyptic, "The Word of the Lord is sent by an angel to Abraham" (Book of Jubilees 12:22); "Lord, Thou speakest on the first day of creation: Let there be heaven and earth; and Thy Word hath accomplished the work" (IV Ezra 6:38).

Under Greek influence in Alexandria the Jews spoke not only of "The Word of the Lord" as coming to the Prophets and announced by them to the people, or as creating and governing the world; the Logos now meant for them a cosmic principle giving existence, order, beauty, life, intelligence to things, dwelling especially in the human mind, not only distinguishing man from beast, but making the human soul a spark, as it were, of divine life and intelligence, and mediating between God and man. The passages attributed by Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* xiii) to the Alexandrine Jew Aristobulus, though probably not older than the middle

[1] Dio Chrys. *Or.* xxxvi. 37, apud Arnim, II, 1129; Jamblicus *De Anima* (Stob. *Ecl.* i. 372; Arnim, II, 1128); and Stob. *Ecl.* i. 79; Arnim, II, 913 (cf. Cic. *De divinatione* i. 55. 125).

[2] Cf. Kohler, *Jewish Theology* (New York, 1918), pp. 197 ff.; and his articles in the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, "Nemra," "Sekeinah," and "Metatron."

of the first century B.C., represent some of the earliest extant attempts of the Alexandrine Jews to harmonize Hebrew revelation with Greek philosophy by means of gnostic allegory. Wisdom (*sophia*), or Logos, is the light which God first created, in which all other things were created, and in which man is given knowledge.[1] The Logos is the spirit or breath of God, the Holy Spirit, the Divine Spirit. Jesu Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon speak of the Logos in terms of Greek philosophy in a manner which comes very near to the meaning of the words in the Preaching.[2]

With Philo[3] the *Logos* is the creative word of God; the angel of Jehova, intermediate between God and the world; the Platonic idea of ideas; the Stoic world-soul. In his confusion and inconsistency, he is an unconscious witness of varying traditions of the Alexandrine philosophy. The upward trend which Posidonius had given to religious thought is plainly discernible in Philo.

Posidonius was the most influential teacher of philosophy in the Mediterranean world in the first half of the first century B.C. Born at Apamea in the Orontes valley, *ca.* 135 B.C., well read and widely traveled, he combined what was best of Oriental and Greek learning into an eclectic system which directly affected the religious and ethical thought of succeeding ages. Astrological elements had been transplanted from Chaldean to Grecian soil by Berosus, a priest of Bel, about two centuries before. It will be recalled that the greatest teachers at the Stoa were from Tarsus, where especially these Chaldean elements had found a congenial abode. But at Posidonius' time many, if not all, the schools of Greek philosophy had gone to impossible lengths of materialism and skepticism, and men who craved better things willingly received the new teaching which opened to them a spiritual world of beautiful hopes. Cumont says of Posidonius:

> Brought up on Plato and Aristotle, he was equally versed in Asiatic astrology and demonology. More of a theologian than a philosopher, in mind

[1] Heintze, *op. cit.*, pp. 190 ff., quoting Euseb. *Prep. ev.* xiii. 12. 664 *C.*

[2] Cf. Wisdom of Solomon, 1:7; 2:2; 7:25; 8:1; 8:4; 8:6; 9:1–10:1; 18:15f.; and read M. Friedlaender, *op. cit.*, p. 63, n. 1.

[3] For the Logos in Philo cf. Norman Bentwitch, *Philo-Judaeus of Alexandria*, (Philadelphia, 1910), pp. 144–60; also pp. 104–31, "Philo and the Torah." Cf. James Desmond, *Philo Judaeus* (London, 1888), I, 27 f.; II, 156–273. For a detailed and classified list of passages cf. C. G. L. Grossman, *Quaestionum Philonearum*, etc., II, 3 ff. It is remarkable that these writers make no mention of Philo's indebtedness to Poseidonios. See Wm. Bousset, *Juedisch-christlicher Schultrieb in Alexandria und Rom* (Goettingen, 1915).

more learned than critical, he made all human knowledge conspire to the building up of a great system, the coping of which was enthusiastic adoration of God who permeates the universal organism. In this vast syncretism all superstitions, popular or sacerdotal, soothsaying, divination, magic, find their place and their justification. . . . . The symbolism of Philo the Jew is often inspired by his picturesque eloquence.[1]

Manlius, Augustus, Tiberius, were his disciples in astrology, and it was from his teaching that the Emperor conceived himself to be "deus et dominus natus." Seneca, Cicero, Plutarch, and the other great eclectic philosophers continued his teaching. But it was especially at Alexandria that the neo-Pythagoreans and neo-Platonists mediated between his and Philo's thought. Between the invisible God and the world of sense there intervene various grades of beings, angels and archangels, all of which at times Philo calls *logoi*. Human souls are such logoi. But it is especially as mediator between God and the world that the logos develops in Philo's thought from the *archetype* of things in the mind of God, through the *expression* of that divine idea as "the son of God," "the only-begotten of the Father," even to "another god."[2] This was the crux of all those theologies which attempted to bridge the chaos between a transcendent God and the material world by the hypothesis of an intermediate Creator.

It was doubtless this difficulty which exposed the theological thought of the time to Hermetic influence.[3] This literature has suffered much transformation within Christian times, but it is generally admitted that its salient characteristics are not later than the first century A.D. It represents God creating the world by his Logos, the Logos being his Son, consubstantial with him, the Father; it speaks of revelation, faith,

[1] F. Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans* (New York, 1912), pp. 84 f.

[2] *Quaest. in Gen.* ii. 62; Frag. II, 625; cf. Euseb. *Praep ev.* vii. 13.

[3] Cf. *Her. Cor.* xi. 11. There has been of late much discussion over the Hermetic Literature. Cf. G. R. S. Mead, *Thrice-Greatest Hermes* (London, 1906); R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres: Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1904); *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 19, 93 ff., 113, 155 f., 158 f.; *Zwei Religionsgeschichtliche Fragen* (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 83–111; G. Parthey, *Hermetis Trismegisti Poemander* (Berlin, 1854); R. Pietschmann, *Hermes Trismegistus nach ägyptischen und orientalischen Überlieferungen* (Leipzig, 1875). Cf. *Her. Cor.* i. 6. 8 f., 10, 12, 21–27, 29 f., 32; ii. 5. 12, 14 f., 17; iii. 1; iv. 1. 3–6, 8; v. 11; viii. 5: ix. 10; x. 7, 9, 14, 24, 25; xi. 11, 14, 22; xii. 7. 8, 18, 20 f.; xiii. 3 f. 7, 14 f., 17, 21 f.; xiv. 8. 10.

repentance, baptism, grace, regeneration, in language familiar to Christian theology. Especially like our Preaching is the use of Logos.[1]

Philo holds firm to his belief in one God, but he yields, as do Justin and some other early Christian theologians, to the extent of admitting some sort of divinities between God and man, especially the Logos-Archangel, of whom he speaks in language at once reminding one of the Hermetic Literature and of the Fourth Gospel.[2] Philo's beautiful allegory, "The Lord Is My Shepherd," applied to the Logos, anticipates the Christian "Good Shepherd" parables.[3] But "the Lord" he is speaking of here is not "the Supreme Father," but that "other god," of whom he speaks "en Katakresei."[4] This is the "Logos mesites" of whom he speaks in his commentary on Deut. 5:2.

In the New Testament we find nothing to compare with the K.P. Logos, except in the writings of John.[5] "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God" (Jo. 1:1). "The Logos became flesh and dwelt among us, and we saw his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth" (1:14). In the Apocalypse (19:13–16) is seen a white horse; and the rider's name is "Faithful" and "True." His garments are sprinkled with blood, and his name is "the Logos of God." Like the Logos in Wisdom (18:15–16), he is a conqueror. On his garments is written, "the King of Kings and Lord of Lords."

Aristides' *Apology*[6] repeatedly uses nomos and logos in a way that suggests the Preaching. There is a passage in the *Shepherd of Hermas*[7] which is certainly related to this passage of the K.P. "This tree, large and shading the plains and the mountains and all the earth, is the Law (nomos) of God given to the whole world; and this Law is the Son of God, preached to the ends of the earth; and the people that are under the shade are they that have heard the Preaching and believed on him." Compared with K.P. VI and VII, the *Shepherd* seems to be quoting

[1] *Her. Cor.* i. 9, 10, 12, 21; iv. 4; cf. Just. 1 Ap. 22. 2.

[2] *De agric.* i. 308, *Quis rer. div. haeres sit* i. 501 ff., apud Grossmann, *Quest. Phil.*, II, 57.

[3] Cf. Friedlander, *op. cit.*, pp. 71 ff. [4] See p. 14, n. 2.

[5] Jo. I:1, 14; cf. I Jo. 1:1; Apoc. 19:13–16, 22, 13; cf. E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel* (Edinburgh, 1906), pp. 145–75; Hastings, *Dict. Bibl.*, art. "Logos."

[6] Aristides *Apol.* xiii. 7, suggests our passage of the K.P. by the repetition of nomoi and logoi.

[7] *Pastor Hermae. Sim.* viii. 3. 2.

"the Preaching" by name. The Letter to Diognetus[1] speaks of "the invisible God sending to men His Logos . . . . not an angel . . . . but the creator (*demiourgos*) of all things." Melito[2] uses *nomos* and *logos* in suggestive proximity. The "old books" he mentions agree fairly well in contents with the Preaching and the books with which it appears in Clement. Justin[3] uses *logos* in a way that evinces his familiarity with the meaning it has in K.P. and the Fourth Gospel, and mentions its use in the Hermetic Literature and by Valentinus and others. Tatian[4] speaks of the nomos of God and "the power (*dynamis*) of His Logos." Athenagoras[5] speaks of "the logos of the Father, the Son of God," and human and divine nomos and logos. Carl Schmidt, in *The Sayings of Jesus*, Aetheopic, c. 17, says: "Ich bin sein vollkommenes Wort"; Coptic: "Ich bin der Logos, ich bin ihm geworden ein Etwas."[6]

Frag. II. That there is "*one God*" is too common in Scripture for comment. The *Sibyl* frequently and emphatically insists "there is one God."[7] The Jews clung tenaciously to this belief, at least in theory,[8] even if the charge was frequently preferred against them, as we shall see (IV), that they adored angels, and Philo found himself, as has already been observed, struggling with the same "other God" difficulty which the Jew Trypho in the *Dialogue* (54. 2) makes Justin try in vain to refute.[9] The Jew Trypho says to Justin (*Dial.* 50): "You seem to have come out of a great conflict with many persons about all these points we have been searching into and therefore quite ready to return answers to all questions put to you. . . . . How can you show that there is *another god* besides the maker of all things? And then you will show that he submitted to be born of the Virgin." Justin replies, quoting Isa. 39:8;

[1] *Ep. ad Diogn.* vii. 1–2.

[2] Melito iii (Goodspeed, *Die aeltesten Apologeten*, p. 309).

[3] Justin *Appendix* 6. 3; cf. 10. 1; *Dial.* 93. 3, 105:11; 121:2; 122:1–2, 5; 123:1–2. I *Apol.* 10:6; 14:5; 23:2; 32:8; 32:10; 36:1 (cf. 34:8); 46:2–6; 63:4; 63:10, 15. Specially noteworthy is the allusion to Hermes in 22:1–2; cf. *Dial.* 54:2. The mention of the "heretics," including Valentinian, in connection with this teaching in *Dial.* 35:6, is also noteworthy.

[4] Tatian *Oratio ad Graecos* vii. 2.

[5] Athenagoras *Supplicatio* 10. 2; cf. 16. 2; 24. 1; 4. 3; 19. 1–2; 32. 2.

[6] Carl Schmidt, "Gespraeche Jesu," *T.U.*, XLIII, p. 56; cf. c. 30, p. 129.

[7] *Sib.*, Frag. I, 7 f. (Geffcken's text); cf. Frag. I, 32 ff.; Frag. III, 3 ff., 11 ff.

[8] W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestementlichen Zeitalter*[2] (Berlin, 1906), pp. 347–67.

[9] *Aet. Plac.* i. 7. 32 f., Diels.

40:1–17. Trypho says it is ambiguous, impertinent. Justin admits that it is, unless viewed in its fulfilment in Christ, and he reviews at length the Scripture proofs of his opinion, insisting that Christ is god because "his blood is from the power of God, not seed of man, not a man of men, begotten in the ordinary course of humanity" (*Dial.* 54). Trypho asks proof which is not allegorical (*Dial.* 55), and Justin promises to give it, but goes into a lengthy discussion of the divine generation of the Logos,[1] and draws parallel instances from Greek mythology of gods being born of virgins, as Perseus of Danae (*Dial.* 67), and tells Trypho he should be ashamed to claim less for Jesus, and accuses the Jews of having cut out of the Scriptures those portions, still found in the Septuagint, foretelling the circumstances of the birth and life and death of Christ (*Dial.* 71). Justin further compares and contrasts the Christian beliefs about Jesus with the Greek mythology about Dionysus and Hercules "who died and rose again and ascended to heaven" (where it is interesting to note the Chaldean influence over Greek mythology, introducing the idea of "ascension to heaven" in addition to dying and "going down" to Hades and "coming up" to life again). But that Justin does not mean to say that Jesus is God, in the full sense that he speaks of God the Father, is plain from what he says in Appendix 6, where he excludes even a name of God, so transcendent is He: "The appellation God is not a name. He is older than any name. Father, God, Creator, Lord, Ruler, are not names, but words of praise or designations of functions. But His Son, who is alone called Son by the Lord, the Logos begotten before all creatures . . . . is called Christ from being anointed. . . . . Jesus, the name of the man and Savior, has significance." And in the *Apology* (chap. 61) he says: "No one can utter the name of the ineffable God; and if any one dare say that there is a name, he raves with hopeless madness."

Similarly, the objection of Celsus: "How should we deem him a god who . . . . performed none of his promises . . . . was condemned . . . . was found attempting to conceal himself, endeavoring to escape . . . . was betrayed by his own disciples?" Origen answers (ii. 9):

> Even we do not suppose the body of Jesus to have been god . . . . nor even his soul. . . . . God is believed to be He who employs the soul and body of the Prophet as an instrument . . . . as the Greeks consider God to speak through the Pythian priestess. So, in our opinion, it was the Logos God, the Son of the God of all things, who spoke in Jesus these words: "I am the way, the truth, and the life." . . . . We therefore charge the Jews with

[1] Just. *Dial.* 61. 1, 3.

not acknowledging him to be god, to whom testimony was borne in many scriptures by the Prophets, that he was a mighty Power of God, and a god next to the God and Father of all.

Like Justin (Appendix 6) above quoted, Origen (c. *Cels.* ii. 64) says: "Although Jesus was only a single individual, he was nevertheless more things than one, according to the different points from which he might be regarded."

Athenagoras, refuting the heathen calumny that the Christians were atheists, says (*Suppl.* 10):

> The Christians believe in God and in His Son, the Logos, who is the first product of the Father, not as having been brought into existence (for from the beginning, God, Who is eternal Mind, had the Logos in Himself). . . . . But inasmuch as he came forth to be the idea and energizing power of all things material, which lay like fallow land. . . . . The Holy Spirit also . . . . we assert to be an effluence of God. . . . . We recognize also a multitude of angels and ministers . . . . to occupy themselves about the elements.

"Poets and philosophers have not been counted atheists for inquiring concerning God in His works, by whose Spirit they are governed, teaching He must be one" (chap. 5). "Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics . . . . teach that matter is permeated by the Spirit of God, Who is one; for God is an artistic fire, advancing methodically to the production of the several things in the world by His spermatic logoi"—a common opinion of the Stoics.

However, we must not underrate the correctness of the heathen accusation that the Jews "worshiped no gods," on which account principally they were persecuted, as we know from Philo's and Josephus' answer to Appion's (ii. 6) charge: "Quomodo ergo si sunt cives, eosdem deos quos Alexandrini non colunt?" as we shall see when speaking of Jewish apologetic. Indeed, much of Philo's work is apparently in defense of Jewish monotheism. The same may be said of many of the Old Testament canonical books; certainly of those written in Alexandria. Read, for instance, the twelfth chapter of Wisdom. In the New Testament faith in one God is earnestly insisted upon. Paul nowhere calls Jesus God, though he places him "above all things," next to "God blessed forever," to be whose people is the crowning privilege of Israel.[1] Matthew, John, and Luke become apologists of monotheism while maintaining the divinity of Christ.

[1] Rom. 9:3–5; cf. Col. 1:15; Jo. 17:3; Mt. 4:1–10, the temptation culminating in Jesus' words (Deut. 32:43, LXX, "the Lord God shalt thou adore, and Him only shalt thou serve," etc.), Rom. 3:30; I Cor. 8:4–6.

Nor was such apologetic anything new. Not only the Jews, but the Greek philosophers had been contending for monotheism. Cleanthes' beautiful hymn to Zeus reiterates the oneness of God. Plutarch[1] quotes the opponents of Epicurus, insisting that "God is not only immortal and blessed, but also philanthropic, kind, and beneficent"; and himself appeals to Chrysippos and Cleanthes in support of his opinion that "heaven, and earth, and air, and sea, of all these there is nothing imperishable and eternal but the one only God."[2] Diogenes Laertius[3] repeats the old opinion that "there is one God, and Mind, and Fate, and Zeus." The Stoics quite generally were pantheists, in the sense that they thought the universe one living Thing, though some preferred a dualistic concept. The neo-Pythagoreans and neo-Platonists,[4] under the influence of Posidonius, took a more spiritual view of the world, which was rather eclectic to the extent of admitting both monotheists and polytheists. Nor is it always possible to say whether a particular philosopher, Cicero, Seneca, Plutarch, is really a monotheist, a deist, an agnostic, or what.

Apparently there was little, if any, practical monotheism among the common people of this period. Indeed we witness a painful struggle coming upon the Christian church when it begins to insist strictly on the monotheism it had inherited in philosophical theory rather than in popular practice. Various epithets were used to distinguish "the Great God," just as the pagans spoke of "Jupiter Optimus Maximus." Between "the Great God" and the world of man there were countless beings of superior powers, and these the pagans, even while contending for monotheism, called "gods" (I Cor. 8:4–6). The Jews called them "angels," and the Christian writers borrowed or created terminology as the occasion demanded, till at length authority fixed the terminology of the "Trinity of Persons" and "Unity of Nature" of God.

The *Shepherd of Hermas* (*Mand.* i. 1) has something very like this passage of the K.P. "First of all, believe that there is one God," etc. Aristides repeatedly affirms there is one God (*Apol.* 1. 3; 13. 5). Similarly Justin (I *Apol.* 16. 6): "It is right to worship the one God"; Athenagoras (*Suppl.* 6. 4) commends the Stoics for acknowledging one God, and says (8. 1): "We know and rightly believe, there is one God";

[1] Plutarch *De Com. Not.* c. 32, p. 1075 *e* (Arnim, II, 1126).

[2] *Ibid.* c. 31, p. 1066 *a* (Arnim, I, n. 536).

[3] Diog. Laert. vii. 135 (Arnim, II, n. 280).

[4] E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*[4], III, 2 (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 129 ff.

and he sets about to demonstrate (8.1) that more than one God is impossible.

"In the beginning God created heaven and earth" (Gen. 1:1) was a familiar expression in Hebrew Scripture. But the "Beginning," *Archê*,[1] like the *logos*, was an expression of Greek philosophy. It is used in both meanings in the Johannine writings: Jo. 1:1, "In the beginning" is apparently the Hebrew use; 8:25, "The Beginning, who also speak to you," Apoc. 1:8; 3:14, seem to be the Greek meaning. This would also seem to be the meaning of Heb. 1:10, and possibly of II Pet. 3:4. The Hermetic Literature is familiar with this usage; for instance, x. 14; "From one Arché all things come, but the Arché comes from the One and Only (God)," etc. Justin (I *Apol.* 28. 3; 55. 6) and Tatian (*Orat. ad Gr.* 5. 1–2) speak of God creating "the Arché," "the Beginning." Justin (I *Apol.* 67. 7) says God created the cosmos on the first day of the week. But in *Dial.* 61 he says, more in accord with K.P.:

> God, (in?) the Beginning, before all creatures, begot of Himself a certain Logical Power, which is called the Holy Spirit, the Glory of the Lord, the Son, Wisdom, Angel, the God, the Lord, the Logos, and on one occasion (when he appeared in human form to Josue the son of Nun) calls himself "Captain." . . . . He was begotten of the Father, by an act of His Will . . . . just as we, when we utter a word, beget the word.[2]

These attributes of God are met with wherever is found belief in a personal God, but there is something unique in the evenness of balance with which the Creator and creature are contrasted in the K.P. The passage is strikingly similar in expression to Wisdom, 9:1–3; 10:1; 13:1–2; *Sibyl*, Frags. I, 7–9; II, 1–3; III, 11–16; the Secrets of Enoch (48:5); "From the invisible He made all things visible, Himself being invisible" (cf. Heb. 11:3); Rom. 1:20; Jo. 1:18: "God no one ever has seen"; (Acts 17:24 f.); the Book of Jubilees (12:2); Aristides *Apology* (1. 3 f.):

> Illum vero qui mundum moveat dico Deum omnium rerum esse, qui propter hominem omnia fecit. . . . . Dico tamen Deum ingenitum, increatum esse, ab nullo comprehensum esse sed ipsum omnia comprehendere, autogenes eidos, sine initio et sine fine (immutabilem), immortalem, absolutum, qui

[1] For the use of this word in Gk. Philos. as the active principle of creation, see in Aristotles' *Physics* f. 9, p. 326.

[2] *The Shepherd, Mand.* 1. 1. Similar allusions to believe in one God are found in Ign. Mgn. viii. 2; Alterc, *Sim. et Theoph.*, I, 4, 6; Jas. et Papisc; Iren. *Adv. haer.* ii. 1. 2: II Clem. ii. 12; xvi. 2. 10; Theoph. *Ad Antol.* i. 3.

comprehendi non possit. Quod vero absolutum eum dico significat defectum in eo non esse, et ei nihil opus esse, sed omnia eo egere. Et quod eum sine initio esse dico significat omnia quae initium habeant finem quoque habere, et quod finem habeat dissolubile esse. . . . . Coelum eum non continet, sed coelum et omnia visibilia et invisibilia in eo continentur. . . . . Immobilis is est, infinitus et ineffabilis, non est enim locus unde et quo moveri possit, neque quasi mensurabilis ab ullo latere definitur neque circuitur, ille enim est qui omnia complet et omnia visibilia et invisibilia transcendit.

Similarly 13. 8, and the Letter to Diagnetus 7. 2; Justin (*Apol.* 10. 1; 14. 1–2; 67. 7, 64. 2–5) compares God's creation of the world by his Logos to the birth of Athena from the head of Zeus and (*Dial.* 127. 2): "The ineffable Father and Lord of all neither comes nor goes, nor sits down, nor stands up, but, in some way, remains in His place, immovable, though He sharply sees and keenly hears everything, and observes all things"; and he goes on to say that the one who walked with Adam in Paradise, shut Noe in the ark, appeared to Abraham, and spoke to Moses, was not God the Father but the Son, the Angel, who became man of the Virgin; no man has ever seen God the Father. Tatian (*Orat. ad Gr.* 5. 1–2; 7. 1–2; 18. 2) says God created all things in the beginning by the power of his Logos, and (4) mentions divine attributes similar to those in K.P. Athenagoras (*Suppl.* 10. 1–2) says, defending Christians against the charge of atheism: "We are not atheists, seeing that we acknowledge one God uncreated, eternal, invisible, impassible, incomprehensible, illimitable . . . . also a Son of God"; and goes on, at this suggestion, to remark: "Nor let anyone think it ridiculous that God should have a son; for, though the poets in their fictions represent the gods as no better than men, our mode of thinking is not the same as theirs. . . . . The Son of God is the Logos of the Father, in idea and in operation."

Frag. III. The difficulties in the reading of this fragment will be considered later on. The translation given above is as close as possible to the reading as it stands in Clement. Many of the alterations which have been suggested by commutators are not needed and often are not warranted.

This diatribe against idol and animal worship was such a commonplace in both Greek and Jewish literature that it is difficult to detect resemblances close enough to warrant conclusion as to relation. Plutarch, for instance, in *Is. et Osir.* (cc. 66, 67, 71, 73, 76, 77) dwells upon the folly of such worship, while calling the attention of the Greeks, who ridicule the Egyptian worship of animals, to the fact that animals

are quite as appropriate images of God as are lifeless idols; animals ought not to be worshiped by man, for they are his inferiors; and yet they are superior to idols, inasmuch as they are living things. He would tolerate worship of both, if it helps to avoid atheism, and does not lead to superstition. See also his whole treatise on superstitions. Horace (*Sat.* i. 8. 1 ff.) is a good example of the educated pagan's attitude toward idols:

> Olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum:
> Cum faber, incertus scamnum faceretne Priapum,
> Maluit esse deum. Deus inde ego, furum aviumque
> Maxima formido; nam fures dextra coercet,
> Obscaenoque ruber porrectus ab inguine palus;
> Ast importunas volucres in vertice arundo
> Terret fixa, vetatque novis considere in hortis.

Juvenal also gives us a sample of what the Romans of his type thought of Egyptian animal worship (*Sat.* xv. 1 ff.):

> Quis nescit, Volusi Bithynice, qualia demens
> Aegyptus portenta colat? Crocodilon adorat
> Pars haec: illa pavet saturam serpentibus ibin.
> Effigies sacri nitet aurea cercopitheci,
> Dimidio magicae resonant ubi Memnonechordae,
> Atque vetus Thebe centum jacet obruta portis.
> Illic caeruleos, hic piscem fluminis, illic
> Oppida tota canem venerantur, nemo Dianam.
> Porrum et caepe nefas violare et frangere morsu.
> O sanctas gentes, quibus haec nascuntur in hortis
> Numina! Lanatis animalibus abstinet omnis
> Mensa, nefas illic fetum jugulare capellae:
> Carnibus humanis vesci licet.

Similarly Josephus (c. *Apion.* i. 28): "King Amenophis desired to see the gods? What gods, I pray, did he desire to see? If he meant the gods whom their laws ordained to be worshiped, the ox, the goat, the crocodile, and the baboon, he saw them already." The Epistle of Jeremy says idols are dumb (8), cannot keep themselves from rust and moth (12); the dust clings to their face till someone wipes it off (14); they are of no more use than a broken vessel (17); they have to be guarded, lest they be stolen out of the temple (18); they are bought for a price (25); have to be carried about, and if they fall they cannot get up (27); they are defiled by impure touch (29); they cannot show

mercy to the widow nor do good to the orphan (38); beasts are better, for they can get under shelter and help themselves (69). The Letter of Aristeas[1] says: "All other men besides us [Jews] think there are many gods . . . . which they adore foolishly, making idols out of stone and wood, saying that these images can afford them something helpful for life. . . . ." Tobit (14:8) alludes to gentile idols; Baruch (6:38 f.) speaks of the Babylonian gods of wood and stone, of gold and silver, and says that they who worship them shall be confounded, and bewails their pitiable folly. Ezekiel (21:21) sarcastically alludes to the Babylonian King "seeking divination, shuffling arrows, inquiring of idols, and consulting entrails." Daniel (3) tells of the great statue of gold and (14) of Bel and the dragon. It is also on account of their idolatry that IV Esdras (13:49) says the Gentiles have no hope of salvation, and the Secrets of Enoch (c. 99) damns everything Greek and compares the Septuagint to the golden calf. In the Book of Jubilees (12:1–5) Abraham exhorts Terah not to worship idols:

> What help or profit have you from those idols you worship and before which you bow? There is no spirit in them. They are dumb forms, and mislead the heart. Worship them not. Worship the God of heaven Who causes the rain and the dew to descend on the earth, and does everything upon the earth, and has created everything by His Word, and all life is from before His face. Why do you worship things that have no spirit in them? for they are the work of men's hands, and on your shoulders do you bear them, and you have no help from them, but they are a great cause of shame to those who make them, and a misleading of the heart to those who worship them.

Wisdom abounds in polemic against idolatry (13:1–2; 13:10–11; 13:16–19; 14:1–4; 14:8; 14:11; 14:15–20, 23–29; 15:5; 15:7–9; 15:17–19), pointing out the folly of worshiping man-made images of wood and stone, gold and silver, which are worthless and helpless. The reference (14:15–16) to the image an afflicted father erected to his son who had been suddenly taken away, which began to be worshiped as a god, and this worship commanded by tyrants, was instanced in the case of Antonius referred to by Justin (*Apol.* 29. 4), Tatian (*Orat. ad Gr.* 10. 1), and Athenagoras (*Suppl.* 30. 2). Emperor worship seems to be meant by Wisdom 14:17 ff. The *Sibyl* (III, 545–62) pleads: "Greece, ... why do you offer sacrifice to gods that are dead?" Frag. III, 7 ff., has much in common with K.P. Philo pleads with men of reason not to dishonor God by thinking dead images and irrational animals or

[1] Aristeas *Ep.* 134, 137.

even the elements and the celestial bodies are like him (*De ebietat.* 28). The theme of his treatise on the Therapeutae, or *On the Contemplative Life*, seems to be the contrast of worship of God in spirit with worship of idols in drunkenness. We have the trite repetition of the folly of worshiping idols of wood and stone and silver and gold, and animals without reason. Similarly in his *De legatione ad Caium* he deplores the foolishness of idolatry and pleads for the Jews who worship God.

Rom. 1:21 ff. refers to those who in their foolishness have changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of corruptible man and of fowls and quadrupeds and creeping things, and have worshiped the creature rather than the Creator, and I Cor. 10:7 warns against idolatry. In Acts 17:29, Paul says to the Athenians, "We should not think what is divine to be like what is made of gold, or silver, or stone, the work of art and of human skill." And he tells the Ephesians (Acts 19:26) that their idols are not gods. Aristides (*Apol.* 3. 3; 7. 4; 12. 6) contends that images are but the lifeless work of man, and (12:7) mentions those (the Egyptians) who worship the sheep, goat, calf, pig, ape:

> et alii alausam; et nonnulli corcodilum et ancipitrem et piscem et miluum et vulturem et aquilam et corvum. Alii felem adorant, et alii piscem Sibbutam, alii canem kai ton lykon kai ton pithēkon, alii anguem et alii aspidem et alii leonem et alii allium et caepas et spinas, et alii pantheram et cetera. . . . . Et Aegyptii ergo non intellexerunt eos qui his similes sint deos non esse, quibus non sit potestas sui conservandi. Et si infirmiores sunt quam ut se servent, quod ad cultores suos servandos pertinet, unde potestas eos adiuvandi erit?

Justin (*Apol.* 9 and 24) speaks of idol and animal worship among the Greeks (?) in much the same way as the K.P. Tatian (*Orat. ad Gr.* 4. 2) mentions "gods of wood and stone," and (9. 1) "things creeping on the earth and swimming in the water, and fourfooted things on the mountains" receiving divine honor. Athenagoras (*Suppl.* 4) says "the Christians are not atheists like that Diagoras who chopped up a wooden statue of Hercules to boil his turnips. He believed in no god at all." He mentions (1. 1–2), again, "the Egyptians thinking cats and crocodiles, serpents and asps and dogs to be gods," and (14. 2) says it is laughable the way "the Egyptians set up these gods in their temples with pomp and ceremony and incense them; and think beasts are gods, and bury them in temples when they die." He uses almost the words of K.P. (15. 1): "We do not worship stones and wood and gold and silver, thinking them gods." The Letter to Diagnetus appar-

ently uses the K.P. in its polemic against idols (ii. 2–3; iv. 2–3). Origen (c. Cels. iii. 19) alludes to Egyptian animal worship.

That God gave man all these things for his use is stated frequently in the Old and New Testaments. Clement of Alexandria (cohort. c. 8, 9) mentions this in his polemic against idolatry. Porphyrius says it was the opinion of Chrysippus that Zeus gave to men animals for their use and for sacrifice to the gods, especially swine (*De abst.* iii. 20; Arium, *S.V.F.*, II, n. 1152). Heb. 2:7 ff., quoting Ps. 8:7 and K. 15:27, similarly represents man's dominion over creatures, which God subjected to him. *The Shepherd of Hermas* (*Mand.* xii. 4. 2) has nearly the same words as K.P. in this passage.

That sins committed in ignorance are pardonable is also stated in Ps. 24:7; Acts 3:17; Just. *Apol.* 12. 11; *Shepherd, Mand.* iv. 1. 5. "The perfect knowledge," which is contrasted with ignorance and imperfect knowledge, is not necessarily (as Dobschuetz thinks, p. 20) the addition of Clement. Similar expressions are found in Rom. 2:20; I Cor. 2:6; 8:1; 12:8; 13:11 ff.; 14:20; I Pet. 3:7; cf. II Cor. 3:14; 8:7; 11:16; Eph. 3:19; I Tim. 6:20; Col. 2:2; cf. Justin, Appendix, 8. 3; Tatian, *Orat. ad Gr.* 12. 4.

Frag. IV. The Jewish manner of worship is repudiated in this fragment with uncompromising completeness. It is difficult to find anything else exactly like this, except in some later apologists, apparently copying the K.P. Paul had not repudiated Jewish angelology, nor did he object to the Jews observing their own law. Even Justin (*Dial.* 47) allowed, "out of consideration for weak-mindedness," the Jewish Christians to observe their law, provided they did not try to force its observance on gentile Christians. The evangelists, too, are quite in sympathy with Jewish angelology, especially Matthew, who is else more hostile to the Jews than the others. What we have in K.P. is really the genuine Greek philosopher's ridicule of Jewish worship of angels and month and moon and observance of days. Jewish apologists commonly contend that the accusation of angel worship brought against "the Jews" was due to confounding "Jews" with "Ophites," and appeal to the Talmud (Mek. Yithro X) where R. Ismael says: "He who slaughters an animal in the name of Michael, the great captain of the heavenly hosts, renders the same an offering to dead idols" (cf. Hul. 40 *a;* Ab. Zarah 42 *b*). "Four keys are in the keeping of God exclusively and not in that of the angels: the keys of rain, of nourishment, of birth, and of resurrection." Targ. Yer. to Gen. 30:22 excludes prayer of petition for certain things to angels (cf. *Jewish Encycl.*, I, 595).

The fact that Jewish authorities found it necessary to forbid or restrain angel worship is worthy of note, and it should be observed that the restraint is not a total prohibition. Sacrifice to angels being eliminated, there may yet remain more than one-half of 1 per cent of angel worship. Josephus (*Bel. Jud.* ii. 8. 7) attributes a special gift of interpreting angel names to the Essenes.

Mention has already been made, in speaking of the Jewish "Law" and of "One God," of what pagans thought of the Jews in this regard. Not all the heathen admired the Law of Moses or tried to observe the Sabbath. Possibly the more common attitude of the educated Greeks and Romans was that which regarded the Sabbath observance as sheer nonsense and laziness, as did Juvenal (*Sat.* xiv. 105 f.):

> Sed pater in causa, cui septima quaeque fuit lux
> Ignava, et partem vitae not attigit ullam.

Apparently sensible pagans, like sensible Jews and Christians, objected only to an exaggerated scrupulousness of exerting one's self on the Sabbath. Bacon[1] remarks on Mk. 2:27, "Sabbath is made for man and not man for the Sabbath," that "the proverb (quoted also in the Talmud) which gives a constructive ground for proper disregard of the Sabbath is unauthentic. It fails to appear in either synoptic parallel and is wanting in the B text." Bacon might have passed a more lenient judgment upon this passage had he used the same criterion he did on the next page in discussing Matthew's and Luke's treatment of Mk. 10:9. Mark portrays Jesus' attitude toward the Sabbath consistently in 3:1–6. It is worthy of note that the Christian evangelists and apologists detect the attitude of their readers toward the Sabbath, to which they successfully appeal. The Book of Jubilees (1:14), "They will go astray as to new moons and Sabbaths and festivals and jubilees and ordinances," is similar in tone to the K.P., and would seem to be a protest against exaggerated formality as well as indifference. III Esdras (7:14) describes a celebration of Azymes, "eating for seven days before the Lord," but it may only mean to emphasize the grandeur of the feast, as it does the Passover celebration (1:1).

There is a contrast between the words (IV) *ginoskein* and *epistantai* which cannot be adequately expressed in English. The former here seems to mean that the Jews rest quietly content in the notion that they are God's people, but have not personally investigated the reasons for such belief, in the way Greek philosophers said life was too short to

[1] B. W. Bacon, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* (1919), p. 70, n. 3.

make sure about the gods, and it was advisable to take religion as we find it, avoiding atheism on the one hand and superstition on the other. "The Jews" are designated in much the same way as in the Fourth Gospel (3:21–24; 7:15 ff.; 8:17, where "your law" is spoken of as if Jesus were not a Jew; cf. 10:34 and contrast "ethnos" in 11:51). Apoc. 2:9 may refer to the Roman, or Catholic, Christians, to whom Hebrews was written, and who produced the irenic literature of Domitian's reign (cf. 3:9). It is not surprising that the visionary John of Ephesus should discountenance such an attitude toward "Babylon" (17:5; 18:2) as was taken by the Roman Catholic church, or the Christian communities from which emanated I Peter. These Petrine writings will be compared below.

Philo says a great deal about angels and archangels, but nowhere says they are worshiped. Still his emphatic insistence on the worship of one God is significant, and he would seem to give the Therapeutae (or Essenes) credit for a monotheism of more than common purity. Doubtless it was Chaldean influence that was filling the heavens of that time with angelic hosts. Philo thought the belief was too common to oppose, and perhaps beneficial, as a wholesome return to spirituality after the bleak winter of Epicurean materialism. (Compare the revival of belief in ghosts in our own time.) Would Philo's silence indicate a diversity of practice and creed among the Jews? Anyhow, there was not a great deal of real difference between the astrological gnosticism of the Alexandrine writers and the Chaldean angelology of Palestinian apocalyptic and rabbinical literature. The part angels were said to play in the physical, the moral, and the religious world is quite well depicted in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (Reuben 2:7; Levi 2:34 ff.), where the "heavens" and "their angels" are described. In the highest heaven is God (34); in the next the archangels (35); then the angels (37); after that the thrones and dominations (38) (cf. Rom. 8:38; Col. 1:16; Eph. 1:21). Perhaps such are the "Judaic myths, foolish questions, and genealogies" and "the religion of angels" mentioned in Titus 1:14; 3:9 and Col. 2:18. The attitude of Hebrews toward the angels is more favorable (1:4, 6, 7, 13, 14; 2:2, 5, 7, 9, 12; 12:22; 13:2), and the Apocalypse of John is thoroughly Jewish in this regard (3:5; 4:4, etc.). The Gospels quite well accord in their attitude toward angels. Mark is too much concerned with demonology to accuse the Jews of worshiping angels, of whom he speaks reverently (8:38; 13:32); but sometimes speaks of "a young man" (16:5, *neaniscan*), as does the Gospel of Peter (10:39), where others talk of angels. Matthew

makes much of them (1:20; 2:13; 2:19; 22:30; 24:36; 25:31; 28:2; 18:10, where, it is interesting to observe, he uses the same language as Philo, *De opif. mundi* 69, in speaking of the highest of the angels, with bodies of purest "hyle," who are ever with God, and "behold the face of the Father." The word *prosōpon*, "person," later became prominent in the trinitarian controversy). Luke frequently introduces angels (1:11 ff., 36 ff.; 2:13 ff.; 4:10, 7:27 ff.; 12:8; 15:10; 11:22; 20:36; 22:43; Acts 5:19; 6:15; 7:53; 8:26; 10:3; 12:7 ff.). John has not so much to say about them (5:4; 19:12). Aristides (*Apol.* 14. 4) is quite plainly using the K.P.: "(Judaei) quoque a scientia exacta aberraverunt et se Deo servire in mente arbitrantur, nationibus vero operum eorum cultus angelorum et non Dei est." The other apologists have nothing to say about the Jews worshiping angels, except Origen in answer to the accusation brought by Celsus (i. 26; v. 6–34), in about the same way as the K.P. and Aristides. Athenagoras rather turns the accusation against the Greeks, and says their heroes are but fallen angels (*Suppl.* 24 f.), and that these heroes were later made to be gods, and the idols and mysteries of Greece and Egypt were invented in their honor (27 f.). Philo has a similar view. expressed in many places. It has already been mentioned that Justin says "the angel" of the Old Testament was Jesus, whom he also calls (*Apol.* 12. 9; 63. 14, etc., cf. Heb. 3:1) "our Angel and Apostle."

The Sabbath and other feasts mentioned here occur frequently in Jewish and early Christian literature Philo (*De septen.* 1. 2, Bentwich, p. 121) enumerates ten feasts observed by the Alexandrine Jews: (1) every day, if used aright; (2) the Sabbath; (3) New Moon; (4) Passover; (5) First Fruit (Omer); (6) Unleavened Bread; (7) Pentecost; (8) New Year; (9) Atonement, the Great Day; (10) Tabernacles. Aristides (*Apol.* 14. 4), continuing the passage quoted above, says: "(Judaei) cum sabbata custodiant et neomenias et azyma[1] et ieiunium (diem) magnum et ieunium et circumcisionem et escarum munditian, quae ne ita quidem perfecte custodierunt." The Letter to Diagnetus (4. 1) speaks of the Jews' Sabbath superstition and circumcision and the fast and new moon. The striking agreement and discrepancy

[1] Cf. Zahn, *G.N.T.K.*, II, 2, p. 823, and Theol. Literatur Z. (1892), p. 38. Mk. 14:1; I Cor. 5:7 (Peschitto). Hilgenfeld would read *hēmeran* for *nēsteian*, making Aristides 14. 4 agree with K.P. IV, but cf. Justin *Apol.* 37. 5 and *Ep. ad Diag.* iv. 1: and Ev. Pet. 11:5; 14:58 (cf. Dobschuetz, p. 37, n. 2; Schürer, I, 239, A 22). Azyma here would seem to mean the entire Paschal week, Nisan 14–21 (cf. Acts 20:6); *Heorten* is probably "Pentecost," and *Megalēn hēmeran* "the Great Day of Atonement." Note a similar confusion in Mk. 14:1; Mt. 26:2; L. 22:1.

between the K.P. and Aristides and the Diagnetus letter might be due to independent use of the K.P. by all three writers, Clement, Aristides, and the writer to Diagnetus. Both Aristides and the Diagnetus writer mention fasting, which does not occur in the Clementine K.P. fragment, though, as will be seen in chapter iv, there are extant probable fragments of the K.P. which make such mention. C. Schmidt's remark on a similar passage in the *Gespraeche Jesu* would agree with this hypothesis.[1]

The expression "Sabbath which is called First" apparently means "the Great Sabbath" (cf. Jo. 19:31; and *Mart. Polyc.* 8. 1), the Sabbath after the Pasch. See Dobschuetz' comment on this passage (p. 43). It can hardly mean "the first day of the week" (cf. Mk. 16:2, 9; Mt. 28:1, Acts 20:7; I Cor. 16:2) for, so far as is known, the first day of the week was not a Jewish feast, though it has been observed by Christians from the first century as "the Lord's day." The Epistle of Barnabas (XVI) treats of the transition from the Jewish Sabbath to the Christian, mentioning these Jewish feasts of New Moon and Sabbath, and with his characteristic allegory maintaining that Christians have begun a new week, or the eighth day.

Frag. V. How soon it became evident that Christians were "a new race" is not easy to determine. It would seem that even before Christ some Jews had begun to realize, as Trypho was forced to acknowledge in his (perhaps fictitious) dialogue with Justin (chap. 47), that it was practically impossible to observe the Mosaic Law as it was interpreted by the Pharisees, and hence sought some reasonable substitute. The Alexandrine Jews apparently found such a substitute in the allegorical spiritualization of Judaism, and there were doubtless several such religious movements as are represented by the Essenes and Therapeutae. John the Baptist, of whom we regrettably know so little, was apparently a leader of such a movement, and men like Apollo (I Cor. 1:12; Acts 18:24) were perhaps active "apostles" of the "new" movement before Christian evangelists appeared on the scene. What is said (Acts, chap. 18) about "Aquila, a certain Jew of Pontus, and Priscilla, his wife," expelled from Rome by Claudius, meeting Paul at Corinth and working with Apollo at Ephesus, is interesting. The strange confusion of the name Simon and the reference to Kephas (I Cor. 1:12, etc.) have never been satisfactorily explained. There is also something in the difficulty experienced in determining whether such literature as the Apocalypse and the Didache are Christian or Jewish. We are not certain about the *Sibyl* III and IV, and there is even reason to doubt

[1] C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 583.

about Philo and Josephus. Nor is the difficulty limited to distinction between Jews and Christians. It is an amusing phenomenon, often repeated, that leading archaeologists contend for the same inscription or monument, respectively claiming it to be Jewish, Christian, Mithraic, Hermetic, Apollonian, etc. The Marcus Aurelius column, the Aberkios inscription, the Hermas *Good Shepherd*, the Mithra caenacula are instances. Nor is this contention anything modern. Justin claimed (Append. 10. 1) that whatever was said that was true is ours, and says (Append. 13) he is a Christian "not because the teachings of Plato are different from those of Christianity, but because they are not in all respects the same." He accused the Mithra mystics of imitating Christians (*Apol.* 66. 4), and the pagans generally of borrowing from Christianity. It was considered honorable to be of ancient descent. A "novus homo" was at least to be suspected. The claim to be "new" was a new claim indeed. The K.P. not only claimed for Christianity the reality of the new covenant promised by the prophets (Jer. 31:31; cf. 11:19); it proclaimed the Christians "a new, a third race," and declared the dispensation of the Jews and Greeks "antiquated."

The pagans recognized the novelty of Christianity (Tacitus *Ann.* 15. 44; Suetonius *Vita Nero* 16), and it was a recommendation, for the old order of things was no longer desired by many. "Philosophy declared," says Zeller,[1] "that all men are of one blood and equally privileged citizens of one empire, that morality rests on the relation of man to man, and is independent of nationality and position in the state; but in so doing it only explicitly stated a truth which was partly realized and partly implied in actual life." Various attempts were being made to realize the philosopher's and the poet's dream, which often proved but vain experiments or, like that which Ploteinos was planning when he died, never materialized. The "Golden Age" was longed for, hoped for, believed to be obtainable in a future life, and the first generation of Christians ardently shared that hope and faith. But as the old generation died off, and the new grew up, this-worldly views began to take form. The millennial hope, an outgrowth of Jewish apocalyptic and heathen mysticism, looked for at least "a thousand years" of fabulous happiness here on earth. Others held to the older belief in an other-worldly kingdom, but set it at a greater, even an indefinite, distance, and began soberly to attend to the affairs of the present life. This attitude is manifest in the Catholic literature of the late first century, and seems to be that of the K.P. Already discernible is the conservatism and retrospection of authority basing its claim

[1] Zeller, *The Stoics, Epicureans, and Skeptics*, chap. ii.

upon the past—the Roman "titulus praescriptions." "What you have learned," "what we have given," as tradition, keep faithfully—is the tone of the Preaching of *Peter*. The very name is noteworthy. Then there is appeal to Scripture. But it is the gentile view of Scripture, the common property of all men not as the exclusive possession of the Jews, for the Jews are a thing of the past; and indeed, were never really more the object of God's providence than were the Greeks. Some of the Jews themselves, at least of the Hellenistic world, had begun to recognize this. The *Sibyl* (V, 247 f.) speaks of the "divine race of blessed Jews." Philo's *Therapeutae* are nothing else, says Friedlaender (*Gesch. der jued. Apol.*, p. 263), than the "geistige Elite des Diaspora-Judenthums," and Philo (*De Abrah.* ii. 15) says "they are the beloved of God of all nations, a race that has obtained the priesthood and the prophetic office for the whole race of men" (cf. I Pet. 2:9). "This especially is desired," says Philo (*De human.* ii. 395) in refutation of the charge of misanthropy brought against the Jews, "throughout the law by the most holy Prophet, to prepare equality, community, concord among all nations, by which things states and cities, peoples and countries, and the whole human race, may rise to the highest benevolence. This has ever been my prayer, and I believe it will yet come about." This hope of Philo's is what the K.P. claims is realized in Christianity. Dobschuetz (p. 45) says the terminology is Pauline. It seems rather commonplace. The thought is quite an advance over Paul's. Compare Rom. 1:14–17; 3:21 f.; 7:6; 9:24 f.; 10:4, 12; 11:1, 17; 15:9 ff.; I Cor. 7:29; Gal. 3:9, 22, 28 f.; Col. 2:10–11. Paul is still thinking in terms of "Jew and Gentile." Even though he conceives a union of the two, it is the adoption of the Gentile into the Jewish inheritance, the grafting of the "wild olive" on to the old trunk. Paul's is the Apocalypse vision of the vast multitude of races gathered with the hundred and forty-four thousand of Israel into a new Jerusalem which is built upon the twelve tribes (Apoc. 4:1–10; 17:2; 21:10–15; 22:15). He speaks glowingly indeed of "the new creation" (II Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15), but it is "service in newness of spirit, not in antiqueness of letter." It is not the "Third Race" of the K.P., nor hardly the "elect race, the royal priesthood, the holy nation, a people of purchase," of I Peter (2:9). Paul can never grant that "Israel is cast off." He cannot say, "If the old had been blameless, a new would not have been sought . . . . that the former has grown old, is antiquated, is soon to disappear" (Heb. 8:8–13), and that therefore we have "a New Covenant."

The Gospels, especially the Fourth, and Acts, contain traces of the old view of two races, the gentile Christians being little better than Jewish proselytes, together with the "new" (Mk. 1:27; 13:9–11; Mt. 5:17; 21:28–32; Acts 11:26; Jo. 4:21–27; 8:17; 10:34; 11:50, where "ethne" would seem from the context to mean the Jewish nation). The Epistle of Barnabas (5:7) speaks of "the new people"; Aristides (*Apol.* 2. 1; *Syr.* 2. 9), doubtless originally agreed with the K.P., dividing the world into "three races," heathen, Jews, and Christians (cf. Geffcken, *Zwei gr. Ap.*, notes on these passages, and Einl. xii–xxxii; also in *Preussische Jahrbuecher* [1903], pp. 225 ff.), and calls them (*Apol.* 16. 4), "gens vero nova et mixtio divina"; and (17. 5) "benedicta vero est gens Christianorum." The Letter to Diagnetus (1) mentions "this new race," and (5–6) draws a fascinating picture of Christian life, "what the soul is to the body, Christians are to the world." Justin (*Dial.* 43. 1; 85. 2; 106. 1; 117. 4; 118. 3; 122. 5; 123. 1; *Apol.* 14. 1; 32. 5; 44. 8; 46. 3; 53. 3; 54. 3; 59. 1; 61. 9; Append. 10. 8) contrasts the "old" with the "new" dispensation, and declares that Christianity is really nothing new, but that whatever is said well by all peoples is Christian (Append. 13. 4; *Dial.* 63. 5; 105. 1; 116. 1: 118. 2; 126–29). Athenagoras (*Suppl.* 32 *et passim*) speaks of Christians in much the same way as the Letter to Diagnetus.

Frags. VI and VIII. These two fragments agree in promising forgiveness of sins to the repentant. In Frag. VI the promise is addressed to the Jews, in Frag. VIII to "all rational souls," probably including "the spirits in prison," as has already been mentioned, and will be discussed more fully below (cf. I Pet. 3:19; Ev. Pet. [X] 41). Dobschuetz' comment (p. 24): "Die Beziehung auf das Kerygma im Hades ist wohl von Clem. Al. an das Citat herangetragen," is utterly unwarranted. The conditions for obtaining forgiveness of sins are the same for Jew and Greek, faith and repentance. It is noteworthy that no mention is made of baptism, and the completely developed expression of the Trinity, found in Mt. 28:19, is as yet apparently unthought of. Faith and repentance are free acts, "if anyone will," only he is responsible for his choice; the part of the apostle is to preach, so that none may have excuse to say, "We did not hear"; having heard, it rests with him freely to choose to believe and repent or not, and the consequence is, accordingly, salvation or damnation.

Forgiveness of sin upon repentance is spoken of in the Prayer of Manasses, Wisdom of Solomon (11:24; 12:10–20; 15:2); Jesu Sirach (3:4); the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (Issachar, 7:1, where it

is interesting to note the "negative confession"; compare Arist. *Apol.* 17. 4); Mark (1:15 f.; 2:5, 7; 6:12); Matthew (9:2; 9:13; 11:20; 12:1 f.; 18:11–13; 21:31–32; 28:18–20); Luke (5:20, 32, 7:47 f.; 13:3; 15:7; 17:3; 24:47 f.); Acts (1:4; 2:38; 3:19; 5:31; 7:30; 11:18; 17:30; 26:20); John (9:27; 20:23); Apocalypse (2:5, 21; 3:3); I Peter (1:21); Hebrews (6:1). The Epistle of Barnabas (5:9; 8:3 and 7; 11:1) is very like the K.P. So also is the *Shepherd of Hermas* (*Mand.* iv. 1. 5; *Sim.* v. 7. 3; ix. 17. 1–2). The Acts of John (Zahn, pp. 241 f.), of Thomas (38:55 f.), *Altercatio Simonis Judae et Theophili Christiani* (viii. 36) bear striking resemblance to K.P. Aristides (*Apol.* 17. 3–4, Syr., cf. Rob., p. 89):

Qua de causa, cum errorem illorum intelligant et ab illis verberentur, tolerant et patiuntur, et illorum valde miserantur quasi hominum qui scientiae inopes sunt et pro illis supplicationes offerunt ut ab errore convertant. Et cum accidit ut aliquis illorum converterit, coram Christianis eum pudet gestorum quae ab eo facta sunt, et Deum laudat, dicens Per ignorantiam haec feci. Et purgat cor suum et peccata eius ei dimittuntur, quod per ignorantium tempore priore ea fecit.

Compare Justin (*Apol.* 15. 7–8; 28. 2; 40. 7; 52. 9; 61. 6–12, where he speaks in language similar to K.P., adding, "Thus far we have been taught by the Apostles"; no mention of baptism).

There seems to be a lacuna in VI. Probably the original reading was something like Acts 1:4, instructing the apostles to remain in Jerusalem twelve years, preaching the gospel of faith and repentance to the Twelve Tribes of Israel; and then continuing, "and after twelve years, go out into the world." The tradition of this twelve years of waiting is mentioned by Eusebius, quoting Apollonius, Acts of Peter (c. *Sim.* c. 5) and frequently in second-century literature, especially that emanating from the "Petrine Tradition," of which more will be said below. The tradition doubtless grew out of the Christians' attempt to answer the question put to them by the Jews of the Dispersion, "If the Gospel is for Jews, why is it preached to Gentiles?" as well as the question put by the Gentiles, "Why did the Jews reject the Gospel?" While it is not necessary to conclude that the *porosis*, or hardening of heart, was connected from the beginning with the tradition of the twelve years' wait in Jerusalem, there is good reason to think it was. See Bacon (*Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* pp. 72 f.), citing Mk. 4:13, 40; 6:52; 7:18; 8:16–19; 9:18–19, 28, 32; 10:13–14 and 24, 26, 32; 14:50. This agrees very well with Paul's attitude toward the Jews who rejected his gospel, even though he did not believe "God had cast off His people"

(Rom. 10:20 f.; Acts 28:25 f.). "The veil is over their heart" (II Cor. 3:15), he says, but he hopes it will be lifted. Carl Schmidt (*op. cit.*, p. 79) says of this passage:

> Dieses Gebot stand nach der Angabe des Clemens Al. *Strom.* vi. 5. 43, als ein authentisches Herrenwort in dem Kerygma Petri, und es kann nicht zweifelhaft sein, dass aus der gleichen Quelle der kleinasiat Apollonius in seiner Streitschrift gegen den Montenismus die *paradosia* von dem zwoelf-jaehrigen Aufenthalt der Juenger in Jerusalem nach der Auferstehung des Herrn geschaepft hat.

And (p. 192):

> Sehr geschickt hat der Verfasser des Kerygma Petri sich dem Dilemma: Weltmission oder Judenmission durch die Annahme entzogen, dass die Urapostel sich zwoelf Jahre hindurch auf Geheiss des Herrn auf die Mission der Juden beschraenkt und dennach erste ihre Weltmission angetreten haben, eine Ansicht, die auch von Tertullian (*De praescr. haeret.* c. 20) geteilt wird: "apostoli primo per Judaeam contestata fide in Jesum Christum et ecclesiis institutis, dehinc in orbem profecti eandem doctrinam eiusdem fidei nationibus promulgaverunt. Von der Judenmission hat der Verfasser des Kerygma scheinvar keine hohe Meinung gehabt, wenn er den Herrn sagen laesst [follows Frag. VI. Cf. pp. 202, 203, n. 4].

He renders, *Gespraeche Jesu* (c. 25, Coptic): "Gehet ihr und prediget den zwoelf Staemmen (*phyle*) und prediget auch den Heiden (*ethnos*)" (cf. c. 31, Coptic). See also Dobschuetz (p. 53) and Zahn (*G.N.T.K.*, II, 2, p. 821, and Act. Joh. Proch., pp. 3 ff.), Pistis Sophia (Dob., p. 153), and the Bruce Papyrus, which speak of eleven years' wait in Jerusalem. Various Gnostic and mystic writings speak of the apparitions of the risen Savior for months, conversing with his disciples (cf. L. 24:49; Acts 1:3; Jo. 20:19–21, 25; L. 24:13 ff.; Mk. 16:9 ff.; Mt., chap. 28; Ev. Pet. 10:41, etc.). Aristides (*Apol.* 15, 2 Syr.) seems to imply a certain stay of the apostles in Jerusalem after the Resurrection: "Deinde hi duodecim ierunt" (cf. Justin *Apol.* 53. 3).

Frag. VII. The word "apostle" in Greek meant a delegate sent with proper authority. Christ is called "the apostle of the faith which we profess" (Heb. 3:1, cf. Justin *Apol.* 12. 9; 63. 14). The authorized collectors of the annual half-shekel offering for the Temple in Jerusalem were called apostles (cf. *Jewish Encycl.*, art. "Apostle"). In the early church preachers were called apostles, to distinguish them from teachers and prophets (cf. I Cor. 12:29; Didache 11:3). "Disciple" was the common designation of the followers of a teacher (e.g., Mk. 2:18). Paul

speaks of "those who were before him Apostles" (Rom. 16:7; Gal. 1:17) and names certain ones, mentions the apparition of Jesus "to *all* the apostles" (I Cor. 14:7), but he nowhere says there were twelve. The Apocalypse is fond of connecting the twelve apostles with the Twelve Tribes of Israel (Apoc. 21:14). Mark mentions the call and election of "the twelve" (Mk. 3:13–19) and mentions "the twelve" in several places (4:10; 6:7; 9:35; 10:32; 11:11; 14:20), but does not call them "apostles." Similarly Luke speaks of "the twelve" (L. 9:12; 18:31; 22:4), but he inserts in the narrative of the election (6:13–16), "whom he called also apostles," and calls them apostles elsewhere (22:14), and promises them twelve thrones (22:30; cf. Mt. 19:28; Apoc. 3:21). Matthew (10:1–2) says: "Calling together *the twelve disciples*, he gave them power. . . . . Now the names of *the twelve apostles* are these." Elsewhere he speaks of "the twelve disciples" (11:1; 20:17), or simply of "the disciples" (16:13; 19:10; 21:1, 6; 26:36; 28:7, 16). John speaks frequently of "the disciples" (2:2, 11, 12; 6:3, 8, 17, 22, 24, 61; 9:2, 9, 28; 13:5, 23, 35), of "the twelve" (6:71; 20:24), of "the apostles" (13:16), but seems to exclude Judas from the election (13:18). In Acts, chapter 1, "the twelve apostles" are firmly constituted the leaders of the Jerusalem community. Aristides (*Apol.* 15. 2) has "these twelve disciples." There is some discrepancy in the names of the twelve: compare the lists in Mk. 3:16–19; Mt. 10:2–4; Lk. 6:14–16; Acts 1:13 (and E. Schmidt, *Gespraeche Jesu*, p. 230). "*Faithful* apostles" sounds like the Ebionite Gospel (Klostermann, *Apos.*, II, Ev., p. 10, n. 26): "Ich waehle je die besten mir aus, die mir mein Vater im Himmel gibt" (cf. Mt. 10:37; *Ign ad Rom.* iii. 2). The *Sibyl* (III, 69 ff.) sings of "the faithful and chosen Hebrews . . . . all everywhere who have listened to the word of God." Apocalypse (2:2) speaks of "some who call themselves apostles, and are not such." The Gospel of Peter (14:59), "We twelve Apostles," etc., will be considered below with the other Petrine writings.

Mark (16:15 f.), "Go into the whole world," etc., sounds like the K.P. Also Matthew (28:18): "Going into the whole world, preach," etc., and Luke (24:47). The Epistle of Barnabas (5:9–10); Aristides, as quoted above (15. 2); the *Shepherd of Hermas* (*Sim.* viii. 3. 2; ix. 6. 5); Justin (*Apol.* 31. 7; 32. 8–9; 40. 7; 42. 4; 45. 5) says, in nearly the same words as the K.P., the apostles went into the whole world and preached. Of course, this is such a common item of Christian narrative that even identity of language is no certain indication of literary dependence. But the recurrence of such expressions manifests that these writers

had the same material in hand and sometimes the identity is so close that one cannot resist the inclination to attribute the sameness to copying.

The "faith" here required for salvation is quite a definite thing and seems pretty much the same as the "faith" of Rom. 3:21 f.; 3:28; 10:9, 17 and Jo. 6:47, etc.: "He that believes in me" (cf. 3:18; 5:24). "What is to come to pass" occurs also in several places in Justin (*Apol.* 39. 1; 44. 11, etc.). "That they may have no excuse to say, we did not hear," is so exactly repeated in the Acts of Thomas (28) and *Theophilus ad Antolicum* (i. 14) that even Dobschuetz admits: "Hier sind die Anklaenge so gehaeuft, dass man vielleicht nicht mit unrecht Abhaengigkeit von dem K.P. annehmen duerfte" (p. 57). See also Justin (*Apol.* 42. 1) and Jo. 15:22. The difficult reading in Frag. VII may be explained by John (17:3): "That they may know Thee, the only true God," and (17:20): "Who through their word shall believe in me."

Frag. IX–X. The appeal to Scripture was common among the Jews (cf. the sermons of Peter and Stephen in Acts 1:15 ff.; 2:14 ff.; 3:12 ff.; 7:2 ff.). And at this time it was just as common among the Gentiles. Not only the *Sibyl*, and poets like Virgil, but even such historians as Tacitus and Suetonius take cognizance of the popularly supposed fulfilment of prophecy. The care with which the evangelists and apologists point out the supernaturalness of the events they narrate, their anxiety to prove Jesus the Messiah promised by the Prophets, may have been enhanced by the presence of the John the Baptist sect. But it also manifests that the Greeks for whom they wrote were not unfamiliar with the Septuagint Scriptures. Justin's *Dialogue* with the Jew is intended primarily for gentile readers. Celsus shows quite as great ease in handling Jewish Scriptures as do the Jews and Christians themselves. Paul's assurance that Festus "knew all, both the customs and questions among the Jews," was probably no exaggeration. The apologists appeal with similar confidence to the knowledge of the Roman rulers.

From this appeal to Scripture, the appeal to apostolic tradition was an easy step. It is even foreshadowed in such expressions of Paul as he uses to remind the Corinthians (11:23) that what he had taught them about the Eucharist was not his, but traditional teaching. Not only Jewish, but gentile converts also, brought with them into the Christian community a predisposition to reverence what was taught about sacred things, especially the mysteries, by proper authority. Apollonius of Tyana, it would seem, though the literature is rather

late and not entirely trustworthy, claimed to be the fulfilment of prophecies made by Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Plato, Virgil, and Horace. Paul, in his sermon to the Athenians (Acts 17:22–31), is made to appeal to Greek authorities in support of his gospel. Plutarch (*On Fate*, n. 9) professes his belief that "the Supreme and first Providence is the understanding or (if you had rather) the will of the first and sovereign, God, doing good to everything that is in the world, by which all divine things have universally and throughout been most excellently and most wisely ordained and disposed." Consoling his wife on the death of their little daughter, he reminds her (n. 11): "In the laws and traditions of our ancestors, when children die, no libations nor sacrifices are made for them, or any other ceremonies which are wont to be proffered for the dead." It was principally because the Stoics and Epicureans denied Providence, or reduce it to mechanical physical law, that men like Cicero, Seneca, and Plutarch found fault with them. Virgil's *Aeneid* is a poet's way of portraying fulfilled prophecy, as his *Fourth Eclogue* is the poet's restatement of prophecy soon to be fulfilled in the dawn of the Golden Age.

It is not far, therefore, that we have to go to look for the reason why the first Christians appealed to prophecy to prove the divinity of their Lord, and his teaching and deeds. It was but natural they should put in the mouth of Jesus such appeal to Scripture as Jo. 5:39 and L. 4:16–30. Similarly, *Gespraeche Jesu* (Aeth., c. 31):

> Wie auch ihr aus der Schrift erfahren habt dass eure Vaeter die Propheten, von mir gesprochen haben, und an mir ist es wirklich erfuellt worden. Und er sagte uns: so werdet auch ihr ihnen zu Wegbuehrern, und alles, was ich euch sagte und ihr wegen mir schriebet (erzaehlet ihnen naemlich), dass ich das Wort bin des Vaters und der Vater in mir ist. So sollt ihr auch jenem Manne sein, wie es euch geziemt. Belehret und erinnert (ihn an das), was in der Schrift ueber mich gesprochen und erfuellt worden ist, und er wird nachher den Voelkern zum Heil [cf. *Strom.* vii. 17; Tertul. *Praeser. haeret.* 32; Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 192].

Luke (24:25–26) has nearly the same, where Jesus, appearing to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, chides them for their incredulity and "slowness of heart to believe in all the things the Prophets have spoken of: how it was fitting that Christ should suffer and thus enter into his glory; and beginning with Moses, explained to them in all the Prophets and all the Scriptures what concerned him." I Pet. 1:10 f. throws light upon the difficult reading of Frag. IX:

> Of which salvation the Prophets have inquired and diligently searched, who prophesied of the grace to come in you; searching what or what manner

of time the Spirit of Christ in them did signify, when it foretold those sufferings that are in Christ and the glories that should follow, to whom it was revealed that not to themselves but to you they ministered those things which are now declared to you by them that have preached the Gospel to you.

To quote Carl Schmidt again (p. 251): "Christus ist somahl Objekt wie Subjekt der alttestamentlichen Offenbarung. Diese dogmatische Theorie der Kirche laesst der Verfasser des K.P. durch die Apostel vertreten." (Follows Frag. IX.)

The writer of the K.P. represents Peter, in the same attitude as does the Acts of the Apostles, "searching the Scriptures." Perhaps the writer himself was such a one as Apollo is depicted to be (Acts 18:24), "powerful in the Scriptures." Even Mark, who, compared with the other evangelists, is not overanxious to quote Scripture, begins his Gospel with a reference to Isaiah foretelling John the Baptist, and records Jesus' own prophecy of his passion (10:33 f.). Matthew's fondness for observing fulfilment of prophecy is notorious. John sometimes remarks how the event reminded them that it had been foretold (Jo. 2:17). The triple division of prophecy into "parables, enigmas, and authentic statement" is noteworthy. "Parable" occurs frequently in the Gospels. "Enigma" (e.g., Mt. 6:4) is something hidden, hence not easy to see (I Cor. 13:12). Parables were sometimes thus obscure (4:34; Mt. 13:35). Justin (*Apol.* 32:1) says: "Moses, the first of the Prophets, spoke *autolexei* thus: (Gen. 49:10)." "Parousia," in Frag. IX, is plainly from the context not the second but the first coming of Christ, his manifestation to the world. What follows sounds very much like the Apostles' Creed. Indeed, Robinson (Harris, "Aristides' *Apol.*²," *T.S.*, I [1893], 23 f.) gives what he considers "the Symbol of the Faith in the time of Aristides," and seems to think (pp. 89 f.) it is foreshadowed in the K.P. Dobschuetz disagrees with him (p. 62): "Dass in unserem Fragm. noch keine Formel vorliegt, zeigt eben jenes *kolaseis*, welches fuer den Weissagungsbeweis charakeristisch, fuer eine regula fidei ohne Belang war." There are snatches of phrases which may be imagined into a resemblance of the creed in many places in the early apologists and even in the canonical New Testament. For instance Acts 13:26–31, where there is mention of God, of Word, whom the Jews besought Pilate to kill; "and when they had accomplished all things that were written of him, taking him down from the tree, they laid him in the tomb. But God raised him up from the dead on the third day." Romans (10:10) mentions an oral profession of faith. Such was made by the eunoch before Philip baptized him (Acts 8:37).

Timothy (I Tim. 6:12) is reminded that he made "a good profession before many witnesses." Hebrews (10:23) exhorts the (Roman?) Christians to hold fast an unswerving profession of our hope," and calls Jesus the "high priest and apostle of our profession." The questions asked the catechumen before baptism are a partitionment of the creed, or the creed is a union of those questions. But our earliest certain evidence of the creed's existence is Rufinus (d. 410), in the West, who compares the Roman baptismal creed with that of Aquileia, where the creed appears in practically its present form. Cyril of Jerusalem, about 350 A.D., similarly comments on the baptismal creed in use at that time in Jerusalem. It is very nearly the same as the Roman. Tertulian, about 200 A.D., in three places (*De praescr. haer.* c. 13; *De virg. vel.* c. 1.; *Ad Prax.* c. 2) outlines the faith which Africa, he says, received from the Roman church: "Credendi scl. in unicum Deum omnipotentem, mundi conditorem, et Filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Maria, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertia die resuscitatum a mortuis, receptum in coelis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos, per carnis etiam resurrectionem" (*De virg. vel.* 1). There can be little doubt that, if this is the creed the Africans got from the Romans, the Roman creed was very nearly the same in the second century that it was in the fourth and now. Tertullian himself, after becoming a Montanist, and the defender of the Paraclete, adds to his creed (*Adv. Prax.* 2): "Qui exinde miserit secundum promissionem suam a Patre spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, sanctificationem fidei eorum, qui credunt in Patrem et Felium et Spiritum Sanctum." It cannot, however, be safely inferred from this that "the Holy Ghost" was not in the creed before Tertullian's time, at least not in the creed which Irenaeus of Lyons represents, which seems to be from the church of Smyrnae. Irenaeus gives a summary of faith in three places (*Adv. haer.* i. 10. 1; iii. 4. 2; iv. 33. 7). It is worthy of note, however, that (*Adv. haer.* iii. 4. 2) where he claims to be giving the creed of the Roman church, he makes no mention of the Holy Ghost, as he does in the other places. Aristides (*Apol.* 15. 2) says: "Hic Jesus igitur de gente Hebraeorum. . . . . Ipse ab Judaeis crucifixus est, et mortuus et sepultus est, et dicunt post tres dies eum resurrexisse et ad caelos ascendisse." The Syriac and Armenian versions add to chapter 2 (cf. Goodspeed, p. 4, n. 6): "Dictum est Deum (eum in spiritu sancto A.) de caelo descendisse, et de virgine Hebraea carnem cepisse." Justin (*Apol.* 13. 3) in answer to the charge that Christians are atheists, makes a profession of faith "in Jesus Christ, who was

crucified under Pontius Pilate, in the time of Tiberius Caesar, governor of Judaea, (we) having been taught that he is the Son of the true God," etc. Similarly in 21. 1; 31; 32; 35. 6; 36. 3; 50. 12, etc. The sending of the apostles into the world is much like the K.P. (49:4; 53:2.). Often Justin speaks of cures effected in Jesus' name (e.g., 48. 1) and of demons expelled (*Dial.* 85). He is expressly stating the fulfilment of prophecy (e.g., *Apol.* 37. 9; 51. 1; *Dial. passim*), and the reason of this is clearly seen in *Apol.* 53. 1. After a long list of quotations from the Prophets, he says:

> We have, therefore, many prophecies (many more might be mentioned), but I stop here, judging that these are sufficient to convince attentive and intelligent hearers, supposing they will be able to understand that not as it is said in the myths about those who are said to be the sons of Zeus do we talk merely, but have no proof.

He appeals to instances of mythology, familiar to the Greeks, of apparitions of the dead in proof of Christ's resurrection (*Apol.* 18–20). And in maintaining that Christ is the Son of God (21) he reminds his readers that Mercury is called the messenger and Logos of God; Asklepios, the physician, ascended to heaven on a thunderbolt; Dionysus, too, though mangled, rose again to life and ascended to heaven; Hercules, also, ascended from the flames; Perseus was born of a virgin, and, like Asklepios, healed the sick; and so many other so-called sons of Zeus died and rose again. But Christ did all these things in fulfilment of prophecy. He tells them (24): "You pay witnesses to swear they have seen dead Emperors ascend to heaven from the funeral-pyre." He ridicules their worship of animals, their mysteries, and the myths of the gods' and goddesses' impurities (25). He mentions (29) the recent instance of Antinous being deified. He alludes to the practices of magicians, and says Christ was not such (30), but fulfilled prophecy. And yet it would seem that along with this appeal to prophecy, of which the litterateurs were making so much, there was functioning in real life the daily increasing practice of magic in the name of Jesus. And it is in reference to this practice that Justin, quite unconsciously it would seem, gives us the source of the collection of articles of Christian faith (*Dial.* 85): "Every demon exorcised in the name of the Son of God, the firstborn of all creatures, who was born of the virgin and endured human suffering, who was crucified by your nation under Pontius Pilate, who died and rose from the dead and ascended into heaven—every demon exorcised in this name, is mastered and subdued." Similar

exorcisms occur elsewhere in Justin and the early Christian literature. See, for instance, Passion of Peter and Paul, c. 56 (Lipsius-Bonnet, I, 166). Origen frequently gives examples of such. The Essenes, it is said (cf. Legge, *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, I, 157) made a vow not to reveal the names of angels. The exorcism formulae of the time were made up in great part of such. The much disputed "discipline of the secret" among Christians may have been in some way related to this Essene practice. "Certain Jewish exorcists at Ephesus" are mentioned in Acts (19:13 ff.), "who attempted to invoke the name of Jesus upon those who were possessed by evil spirits, saying: 'I adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preaches.' And they were certain seven sons of the Jewish chief priest, Sceva, who were doing this"—apparently a perfectly respectable practice in those days! Note also, that the charge under which the apostles were arraigned by the Jewish authorities (Acts 4:7) was the practice of magic in the name of Jesus. Matthew (21:27), after relating the strange incident of Jesus cursing the fig tree, makes the chief priests and elders of the people put this same question to Jesus: "By what power do you do these things?" and again (7:22) lets Jesus say: "In that day many will say to me, 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name cast out demons, and in thy name done many wonders (*dynameis*)?'" Luke (17:10) makes the apostles say to Jesus: "Even the demons are subject to us in thy name." It does not at all necessarily follow from this that Jesus or the apostles practiced magic, but it is manifest that when the gospels and acts were written magic practice had become quite common among Christians, and the exorcisms, similar to those in pagan use, were convenient statements of Christian belief about Jesus, which the apologists defended by appeal to Scripture prophecy.[1]

These summaries of Christian faith grew, perhaps imperceptibly, into the creed; how early cannot, it seems, be affirmed with any certainty. What appears here in the K.P. is doubtless among the earliest attempts briefly to state what the apostles preached, and the repeated appeal to Scripture proof would point to an early date, and the absence of allusions to Greek mythology, so common in other apologies, would indicate an atmosphere charged with Jewish influence, not very unlike that of the older elements in the earlier chapters of Acts and indeed the sermons given

[1] See F. C. Conybeare, "Christian Demonology," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, IX (1897), 59–114; also his *Myth, Magic, and Morals*, for much suggestive material, though he is at times too sweeping in his generalizations and undervalues the force of Scripture appeal which was in demand among the Gentiles even more than among the Jews. Compare the appeal to Scripture among Catholics and Protestants.

throughout the Acts (e.g., 17:2 ff.; 28:23 ff.). See also the Epistle of Barnabas (5:6–7).

It is to be noted that, while "faith" (*pistis*), "believing" (*pisteuontes*), is the main thing in conversion, even to the ignoring of baptism (!), this faith is rather a knowledge, a firm conviction, the result of religious experience (*epistēmē*, *gnōsis*, *epignontes*, *epignous*). These words also occur in other New Testament and early apologetic writings (see Grimm-Thayer, *N.T. Greek Lexicon*, and Goodspeed, *Index apologeticus*). There can be no doubt that faith in this sense, as it was conceived by Paul[1] was in great measure an adaptation from the Hellenistic mystery religions of redemption.

The "parousia" spoken of (IX) is evidently the first advent of Christ, or his manifestation in the incarnation. "The things that are to come to pass after him" may refer to the second coming, or the "parousia" generally meant in early Christian literature. The Muratorian Fragment (20 ff.) speaks of the two advents: "nativitas, passio, resurrectio, censervatio (conversatio?) cum discipulis, geminus adventus." The absence of insistence on the parousia is remarkable, considering the prominence of this thought in other early Christian writings.[2] It would seem (from Mt. 24:32–34, compared with 24:23–25, or 10:5–23 with 28:19–20) that there is more than one source behind even the synoptic view of the parousia. The same difference is noticeable between the Pauline epistles and the later gospel material; also between the Apocalypse and I Peter, for instance, or James (5:7): "Be *patient*, therefore, brethren, until the coming of the Lord. Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth; *patiently* bearing till he receive the earlier and the latter." It is evidently with this latter literature that the K.P. agrees.

The Petrine Literature. To facilitate comparison with the Preaching of Peter, the Gospel of Peter, the Epistles of Peter, the Acts of Peter, the Apocalypse of Peter, and the sermons of Peter recorded in the

[1] See W. H. P. Hatch, *The Pauline Idea of Faith in Its Relation to the Jewish and Hellenistic Religions* (1917), especially p. 73; and S. J. Case, *The Evolution of Early Christianity* (1920), especially chap. ix; also R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen* (1910), pp. 9, 36, 91. For a thorough treatment of Paul's use of the words "faith" and "believe" see E. D. Burton (International Critical Commentary"), *The Epistle to the Galatians* (1920), pp. 476 ff.)

[2] Mk. 9:9; 13:6–32; 14:62; Mt. 24:3, 32–44; 10:23; 15:26; L. 21:31–36; 22:29–30; 22:69; Jo. 6:41; 11:25; 12:25 f.; 12:48; 14:3; 14:28; 16:16 f.; 17:24; 18:36; Rom. 13:11; II Thess. 2:1–12; Apoc. 22:7–20; II Pet. 3:10, cf. 3:8; Didache, chap. 16; Ep. Barn., chap. 21; and the apocalyptic generally.

Acts of the Apostles and in the Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions*, are gathered here, noting only the similarities, though it should be remarked that here as elsewhere the dissimilarities are sometimes greater.

The Gospel of Peter (X), 41, mentions the preaching of Christ to the souls in prison, which is probably in a K.P. fragment (*Strom.* vi. 5. 48 f.) (cf. I Pet. 3:19); (XIV) 59 speaks of "the twelve disciples." "Jesus" and "Azymes" are used as in K.P. "Israel" occurs twice, "Jews" six times. The word "Evangelion" might be insisted on. It was a common Greek word, but received a new and special meaning, apparently in the Petrine tradition (cf. Bacon, *Is Mark a Roman Gospel?* p. 40). Reading Ev. Pet. 1:1, 45–46, one is convinced he has before him a fragment older than Mt. 27:24, 54, certainly older than Mt. 28:18–20. "Der neue Fund," says Dobschuetz (p. 68, n. 1), "legt es allerdings nahe, daran zu denken, dass im Kerygma Petri das Evangelium Petri benutzt sein moechte."

The Epistles of Peter have some material in common with K.P., viz.: K.P II; II Pet. 3:4–5—K.P. III: I Pet. 1:14—K.P. IV: I Pet. 3:22; K.P. III: I Pet. 1:14—II Pet. 1:4; 2:11—K.P. V: II Pet. 3:17; V: I Pet. 2:9–10—K.P. VI: II Pet. 3:9—K.P. VII: I Pet. 1:12; I Pet. 1:5; 1:10; 1:21; 1:23 ff.; 2:1–2; II Pet. 1:15 ff.; 3:1—K.P. IX; I Pet. 1:11.

The Acts of Peter with Simon (c. 5 f.):

> Lugentibus autem eis et ieiunantibus, iam insticiebat Deus in futurum Petrum in Hierosolymis. Adimpletis *duodecim annis* quod illi praeceperat Dominus, Christus ostendit illi visionem talem, dicens ei: Petre, quem tu eiecisti de Judaea adprobatum magum Simonem, iterum praeoccupavit vos Romae, et in brevi scias; omnes enim qui in me crediderunt dissolvit astutia sua et inergia sua Satanas . . . . noli moras facere; crastina die proficiscere . . . . [cf. K.P. VI].

Schmidt says ("Praxeis Petrou," *T.U.*, XXIV, 1, p. 81):

> Ob und wie weit das K.P. auf die theologische Gedankenbildung des Verfassers der Petrusakten einen merklichen Einfluss ausgeuebt hat . . . . laesst sich leider bei den geringen Fragmenten jener Schrift nicht entscheiden. Unter aller Reserve moechte ich noch auf die Predigt in Kap. 24 hinweisen, wo Petrus dem Simon Magus gegenueber, der die landlaeufigen Einreden der Juden und Heiden wider die Gottheit Christi vorbringt, elf Stellen hintereinander aus prophetischen Büchern citiert. . . . . Auf das K.P. fuehrt mich die von Clemens Al. *Strom.* vi. 15. 128 citierte Stelle . . . . [quoting K.P. IX]. Vielleicht waren neben den allegemeinen Angaben auch specielle Citate aus

einzellen alttestamentlichen Schriften beigefuegt, jedenfalls ist die theologische Haltung in den Petrusakten dieselbe, da Petrus seine Predigt mit den Worten schliesst: "O viri Romani, si essetis scientes profeticas scripturas" [p. 72, 13 ff.]. Ebenso heisst es [p. 61, 8]: "tractabat eis Petrus de propheticas scripturas."

The Apocalypse of Peter (c. 5) speaks of "us the twelve disciples," like the K.P. (VII) and the other Petrine writings.

The Acts of the Apostles gives seven sermons of Peter, which in many aspects bear resemblance to the K.P. Compare the following passages: K.P. II: A. 3:12–26—K.P. V: A. 2:39 (contrast A. 22:21 ff.)—K.P. V: A. 10:35)—K.P. VI–VIII: A. 2:38; 3:17; 3:19; 5:29–33; 10:43—K.P. VII: A. 1:16–26; 1:24; K.P. VII: A. 3:16; 10:42—K.P. VII: A. 4:4; 6:15; 7:11—K.P. IX: A. 1:16: 2:16–23 (10:35–43); 3:15.

The Clementina contain much material which was doubtless once upon a time common with the K.P., but which cannot now be picked out of the vast accretion of romantic fiction. Compare K.P. III with *H.* x. 16; x. 9. 23, 25; vi. 23; xvii. 7; *R.* v. 20. 30.

"Alle diese Schriften," says Bardenhewer (*G.A.L.*, I, 351), "sind inhaltlich auf das engste miteinander verwandt und ohne Zweifel aus einer gemeinsamen Vorlage oder Quelle geflossen."

From the foregoing comparison it is apparent that as far as can be determined from the extant fragments, the sources of the K.P. were remotely and indirectly at least both Greek philosophy and O.T. Scripture; proximately and directly, the principal source was Jewish-Hellenic thought, Christianized and restated on the basis of the Petrine tradition. In the language, probably of Alexandria in the late first Christian century, it restates the personification of Nomos and Logos; belief in, and worship of, one only God, invisible, the Creator of the world; repentance for sin committed in ignorance; appeal to Scripture and supernatural revelation handed down by tradition; polemic against idol, animal, and angel worship; and connects all this with the historic person, Jesus, a dying, rising, heaven-exalted hero-god, foretold by Scripture, and the mediator of a "New Covenant" with God, which is to replace the antiquated Greek and Jewish dispensations.

The similarity of thought and expression between the K.P. and Jewish-Hellenistic literature of Alexandria—Wisdom, the *Sibyl*, Philo—and the suspicion of Valentinian Gnosticism which attached to it from its having been used by Heracleon, point to an Alexandrine source, even if the K.P. were itself free from Gnostic taint. But there is an

unmistakable Gnostic flavor in its use of such words as *epignous*, *gnōsis*, *dynamis*, *psychai logēkai*, etc. But probably this would be sufficiently accounted for by the common use of such vocabulary, borrowed from the mystery religions of the day, or possibly by the writer's former initiation into such mysteries, or at least his consciousness of addressing men who had been so initiated.

Waiving the question of relative chronology for the moment, it seems impossible to point to any source which the K.P. used verbally. It is familiar with N.T. material, especially such material as is found in the sermons of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles. But even here literary dependence cannot with certainty be affirmed. The two documents more probably have a common source. Again, even such striking similarity as is seen between K.P. VI and Rom. 10:14, or K.P. IX and Jo. 15:22, does not necessarily indicate literary dependence. Some kinship of thought and expression must surely be conceded, in like manner, between the K.P. and the Hermetic Literature. But here again it is probably of an unliterary kind. There is, however, unmistakably a literary dependence between the K.P. and the *Apology* of Aristides, of Athenagoras, the *Shepherd of Hermas*, the *Sibyl*, the Epistle to Diagnetus, the Epistle of Barnabas, and probably also Justin, Tatian, and other apologists.

For the present purpose it will be enough to consider the parallels between the K.P. and Aristides, the *Shepherd*, and Barnabas.

A careful comparison of K.P. and Aristides will surely leave no doubt that either Aristides used the K.P. or vice versa. That K. used A. is not only improbable, considering the primitive simplicity of K. and the application and repetition of A.—e.g., the "third race" expression fits in so naturally in the K. passage, introduced by the comparison of the Old Covenant, which is antiquated, with the New, which the Christians have received and in which they worship God in a "new way" as a "third race," not as the Jews and Greeks—but is also excluded by a further comparison of K. with Pastor Hermae and Barnabas. It is quite plain that P.H. used K. The literary parallels are too numerous and close to be accounted for in any other way. The material common to the two is so much more congenial to K. than to P.H. that there can be no doubt it was P.H. that borrowed from K. The same is true of Barnabas. The prophetic announcement of the parousia, sufferings, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ; the mission of the apostles to preach (*kēryssein*) the forgiveness of sins, to announce the future, the *exousia*, *diathēkē*, *sabbaton prōton*, *neomenias*, *martyrion*

of those who having heard did not believe—all this common material cannot have come by accident, and it is plainly more congenial to K.P. than to Barnabas. The fact that B. and P. do not use K. so freely as A. did, is easily understood, considering the allegorical character of B. and the apocalyptic character of P. That K. is so much in accord with A. is only another proof of its apologetic character. Moreover, as Robinson has already observed (p. 91), the Epistle to Diagnetus has material in common with K.P. which does not appear in the present Aristides apology. From this it may be argued that the writer to Diagnetus had both the K.P. and A. However, considering that our Aristides is also quite a patchwork of fragments from the Greek, Syriac, and Armenian remnants of the original apology, we cannot press this argument. It is highly probable, though, that both Aristides and Diagnetus contain other fragments of the K.P. which cannot be recognized, from the lack of more knowledge of what the original K.P. contained.

It seems reasonable, then, to conclude from what has thus far been said, that the K.P. is apologetic in character. This will be still more apparent from what is to be said in chapter iii. There seems no room for doubt that the K.P. is older than the Aristides apology; and room for very little doubt that it is older than the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the Epistle of Barnabas. The date of these writings will be considered in chapter iv, and an attempt made to determine the date of the K.P. more narrowly.

III

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC

In literary discussion of this kind there is danger, against which one must try to be constantly on guard, of forgetting that writings of whatever sort, including such apologetics as are here under consideration, are little more than the record of the thought of an accomplished few, rather philosophically inclined, and that such thought is little more than an effort to adjust one's self consciously to his whole being's reaction to the new situations in which he finds himself drifting with the irresistible stream of ever "changing, testing, shifting" human life of which his is a part. The philosophical systems and schools of Greece are but expanses of this stream of thought; and the writings which have preserved that thought for us are but the record of the adjustment of great minds to their environment, an environment composed of elements from various earlier sources, blending in the new, as our environment in America is a blending of elements that have drifted to us, colored by the soil and tempered by the climes through which the stream and all its tributaries flowed. When those philosophers discussed the origin of things, the composition of bodies, the relation of the gods to man, they were doubtless reacting to their environment as vitally as the modern pragmatist to the demand of something more "workable" than the senescent systems the schools were trying in vain to rejuvenate. It was not from mere personal caprice that the "Physiologists" tried to define the world in terms of nature. It was doubtless reaction against exaggerated Olympianism; as the gods of Olympus were raised to their dignity not so much by the poetry of Homer as by the reaction of a race of men who were dissatisfied with the grosser "gods of the earth." Nor was it mere aesthetic superiority that lifted Socrates and Plato out of the snarling dialetics of the Sophists into "the place of eternal truths"; nor again any peculiar earthly-mindedness of Aristotle that planted his system firmly on the ground of empiricism; nor desperate pessimism and optimism that divided the schools that followed. Real vital problems were being struggled with all this time, and the philosophers have left us a partial record of their solutions.

But all this time, outside the cloisters of the philosophers and the poets, the mass of Greek men and women engaged in matter-of-fact

concerns of life, with all its joys and sorrows, with its cravings for comfort and encouragement, and hope-giving assurances that would make life worth living, there flowed the unfailing stream of popular religion, which was creating, and solving in their very creation, those problems over which the philosopher with all his wisdom was worrying. Doubtless there were then, as in later times and now, ceremonious demonstrations of grief and gladness, the whole people sympathizing with their divine patrons and helpers, and devotion fed the creative imagination with additions and modifications of traditional mythology to meet new needs, and the new creations inspired fresh devotion, the experience of which was a comforting support to a life of trial and toil. These mystery religions, springing from undiscovered sources in the dim past, had grown and thrived and died away, leaving their heritage to younger cults, till, at the birth of Christianity, the Graeco-Roman world was rife with popular religions, thrown together in intimate association by the mighty empire which not only established means of easy communication, transportation, and travel from the Isles of the North to the cataracts of the Nile and the banks of the Ganges, but shifted great masses of population to distant homes, encouraged the wanderlust of the soldier, the merchant, the craftsman, and the laborer, and trafficked in slaves as extensively as in chattels.[1]

Easily it happened that the stranger in a strange country found himself estranged from his gods, and easily he learned to worship in new ways. But it also happened that what might have passed unnoticed in his home religion, to which he had been inured from childhood, now in his new cult aroused his indignation and protest, especially if the practice contradicted his standards of morality or demanded expense to which he was not accustomed, or which seemed exorbitant. His observations called the attention of others to the defects and created discontent. Moreover, during the first century B.C. especially, itinerant preachers had been popularizing various doctrines which were welcomed by those who felt any dissatisfaction with their old religion—not to the abandonment of the old, but to a considerable detriment, as it helped them to a more enlightened view which gradually prepared the ground for world-religions like Mithraism and Christianity, and which Judaism might have been, could it have been denationalized.[2] The Egyptian

[1] See Case, *The Evolution of Early Christianity*, especially chaps. iii and vi: L. Friedlaender, *Sittengeschichte Roms.*[9], chaps. iii and vii and i, pp. 158–237, 389 ff.

[2] M. Friedlaender, *Geschichte der juedischen Apologetik als Vorgeschichte des Christentums*, pp. 99, 292; Zeller, III[4], 315 f.; and Krueger, *Philo und Josephus als Apologeten des Judenthums* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 44.

mysteries of Isis worship, the Phrygian cult of Cybele and Attis, especially, were widely popular. But it would seem that no other religion of the Mediterranean world made such a strong appeal to the moral sense as the Jewish.

After Alexander's diffusion of Hellenic culture had created such centers of enlightenment as Alexandria and Antioch, and the cities of Cilicia and Asia Minor were thronged with Greeks and orientals, it was but natural that Jews in this "Hellenic Dispersion" should, like their fellow-citizens, become aware of certain antiquated disadvantages of their religion, as well as of its superior elements, and seek to readjust their beliefs and practices to the demands of this newly awakened religious consciousness. The Jew never entirely broke away from his national connection with Jerusalem, and there was continual communication between "the Holy City" and "the children of God that were dispersed." This communication mutually affected the Palestinian and the Hellenistic Jew. Saul of Tarsus was "raised a Pharisee," and there was at Jerusalem (Acts 6:9) a strong element with pronounced Hellenistic tendencies. The opposition, as usual, emphasized the points of difference, the one party insisting ever more rigorously on conformity to "the traditions of the Fathers," the other protesting against man-imposed burdens.

The political situation and national vicissitudes following the Babylonian captivity, enhanced by the struggle against the Syrian monarchs, whetted the pious Jews' expectancy of a messianic deliverer, or provoked them to look for a general collapse of the wicked world, to be followed by a new state of things in which "the people of God would be triumphant," "when Japheth would dwell in the tabernacles of Shem, and Canaan be his slave." This apocalyptic hope was strong enough to keep many a good Jew to a faithful observance of the Law. Others looked for a more worldly kingdom, and sought to appease the existing ruler, or threaten him with God's vengeance, while making the best of a hard lot. While outside of Palestine, especially in Alexandria, the Jews had given up in great part the observance of the Law and placed their hope in a virtuous life[1] they still clung to their Jewish nationalism and a more or less dormant hope of a future Messiah.

This messianic hope of the Jews was nothing strange to their gentile neighbors. A Golden Age of some description was the vague hope that comforted many a one who took a pessimistic view of the world. But it was the beautiful life of virtue the Jew aspired to, and the sublime

[1] Strabo xvi. 2. 55, and Diodorus ii. 85; xx. 3.

spirituality of the incomparable Hebrew Scriptures that most attracted the better sort of folk among the Gentiles.[1] The Hebrew Scriptures had been translated into Greek and several excellent contributions of Alexandrine composition added, especially adapted to the Hellenistic world. These Scriptures were not unknown to the educated Greek-speaking world and could be heard read in the synagogues, of which there were many in the cities and larger towns. It is estimated[2] that there were in the first century B.C. a million Jews in Egypt. And at Rome, where they had begun to locate in the time of the Maccabees, and were greatly multiplied in Pompey's time (63 B.C.), there were at the end of the first century B.C. not less than 8,000.[3] Proselytes and "Godfearers" were numerous, in spite of the nationalist restrictions and humiliating conditions for obtaining this much coveted participation in the Jewish religion. There can be no doubt that had these restrictions been relaxed the Jewish religion would have given fair promise of becoming a world-religion. It was this attraction to Judaism and the easy conditions of admission that gave Christianity such recommendation when it appeared.

From an all but imperceptible beginning in Palestine, a new religious movement, the offspring of the Jewish religion which the world had long admired but which shut out the Gentile from full and free share in its nationalizing exclusiveness—a movement instinct apparently from the start with Hellenistic humanness and world-wide sympathy, centered about the lovable person of Jesus, whom the Jewish authorities had succeeded in having the Roman governor remove by execution, but whose memory lived on and gave life and light and enthusiasm to those who found in him the living expression of all that was best in the religion they demanded as their own and the whole world's. The opposition and persecution excited by the little band of Jesus' disciples brought them to the realization of the fact that they were one, inasmuch as they were the common object of Jewish persecution, and that their "community" made little distinction between "Jew and Greek." Forceably driven, if not freely emerging, beyond Palestine, communities sprang up in all the Mediterranean world. Love of God and man, enthusiastic attachment to Jesus and all his name stood for, and an ardent hope of his glorious return, an unwavering assurance (*pistis*) resulting from religious experience of having broken with sin and turned to God

[1] Schuerer, III, 24 f.

[2] Schuerer, *Die Gemeindverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 61. For an exhaustive treatment see Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'empire romaine.*

[3] Pliny *Ep.* x. 96.

(*metanoia*), mystically signified by baptism and manifested by spiritual emotion (cf. e.g., Acts 10:44)—these, and not nationality or other formality, made disciples of Jesus, and made them in countless numbers, not only among the Jews of the Dispersion but also and especially among the Gentiles. Within half a century the new religion had spread around the shores of the Mediterranean and grown so prominent that we hear complaints of the pagan temples being vacated.[1]

While Christianity was thus rapidly spreading; while the missionaries were concerned almost exclusively with their new converts, instructing them principally by preaching, or by letters as occasion demanded; while the Christians themselves lived in the enthusiasm of their new religious experience and fervent expectation of the coming of Christ, little attention was given to parrying pagan attacks upon the new religion. But toward the end of the first century, when the prophet John of Ephesus lifts up his voice in an apocalyptic burst of zeal to deplore that the churches "have left their first love," or are "blasphemed by the synagogue of Satan," or are annoyed by "those teaching the doctrine of Balaam," or are "eating things offered to idols," or are "dead" spiritually, or "are neither hot nor cold"; when "heresies" are beginning to break out; when the spiritually gifted are in clash with the worldly prudent who are trying to restore order by means of organization; when the church of Rome is called upon to assume the responsibility of leadership (Heb. 5:12), and responds with a tone of authority and a note of irenic conciliation, counseling respect and obedience to civil authority instead of frantic insubordination, unity instead of division, and begins actively to quell religious rebellion even at Corinth; when we find "Catholic" epistles, or encyclical letters, and those carefully composed "Gospels," in circulation; when the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles is beginning to be insisted upon as the norm of Christian belief and practice, and the Acts of the Apostles recounts the origin and growth, under the guidance of the promised Spirit of Truth, of the "Church" and the organization of its "ministry"—it is plainly time to expect that Christian writers are ready to devote their attention not only to "those within" but also to take cognizance of the interests of the church even among those "who are not of the fold."

Christianity was not the first religion that had struggled for existence in the Mediterranean world. It was not the first that had been persecuted and calumniated. And when it saw itself confronted by opposition and called upon to defend itself, it had not far to look for material

[1] Pliny *Ep.* x. 97.

and a model for its task. For centuries rationalizing Greek philosophy[1] had been conducting a polemic against irrational superstition and idolatry, while at the same time portraying in eloquent language the dignity of man, the beauty of virtue, the well-ordered providence of the universe, the unity of nature which it extolled as God. Ridicule of divination, of animal and idol-worship, of superstition, of the impurities and debaucheries of the gods and goddesses, had become commonplaces of polite literature and philosophy.[2] The mystery cults had allegorized and spiritualized traditional mythology into quite a respectable, often truly sublime, system of theology.[3] Historians and scientists had tendered their service to the cause of truth. But it was especially the great Jewish apologists[4] that directly influenced the Christians, for the attacks upon Christianity were often identical[5] with those upon Judaism, the two religions being for some time hardly distinguishable to the heathen.[6]

In a certain sense, the entire Old Testament, especially the Septuagint translation, was an apology for Judaism. Not only is this clear from the result of that translation and the use it served the Alexandrine Jews, but it is explicitly stated in such apologetic literature as the Pseudo-Aristeas Letter. The Epistle of Jeremy, the Books of Maccabees, Esther, Judith, Tobit, the Apocalypses of Daniel, of Baruch, of Enoch, the *Sibyl*, the Wisdom of Jesu Sirach, and the Wisdom of Solomon, are in great part apologetic. But it was in Alexandria in the second century B.C. that Jewish apologetic in the stricter sense began. "Polemical tracts forged against the Jews came into vogue during the reign of Physcon (146–117 B.C.), and they certainly continued to be the fashion" (Mahaffy, quoted by Charles, *Jewish Apoc. and Pseudepig.*, I, 158). Calumnies of every variety were invented to arouse suspicion or hatred

[1] Decharme, *La Critique des traditions religieuses chez le Grecs;* Dodeckenmeyer, *Die Geschichte des gr. Skeptismus;* Case, chap. viii.

[2] Origen *Contra Cels.* i. 26; v. 6; Geffcken, *Zwei gr. Apol.*, XXIV, 41 and 73.

[3] Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterien Religionen;* and Case, chap. ix.

[4] M. Friedlaender, *Geschichte der juedischen Apologetik als Vorgeschichte des Christentums*, Zuerich, 1913.

[5] For instance, the calumny that the Jews adored an ass's head, Josephus *Against Apion* ii. 7; see Friedlaender, *Gesch. jued. Apol.*, p. 375; Tacitus v. 3–4 and v. 5. The same calumny was spread against Christians, see Min., *Felix*, *Octavius*, chaps. ix, xxviii; and Tertullian *Apol.* xvi; the Graffiti, still extant in the Kirchinianum, Rome, representing either a Christian or a Jew adoring a crucified ass, is well known.

[6] See Suetonius *Vita Claudi* 25.

against the Jews. History was falsified, the Jewish practices were ridiculed, their antiquity denied, their morality reproached, their racial attachment misinterpreted, their exclusiveness was considered misanthropy, their aversion to pagan worship declared treason, and such ridiculous stories as that they adored an ass's head in the Holy of Holies in Jerusalem told and believed. Aristobulus, who wrote about 170–150 B.C., is said to have been the first Jewish apologist, but what is attributed to him is probably not older than the first century B.C. Philo, early in the first century A.D., and Josephus, toward the end of that century, were the greatest of Jewish apologists whose works have been preserved. Of Artapanus not much is known, further than that he lived in Egypt in the beginning of the first century B.C. and defended Judaism against heathen calumny, contending that the Egyptians were greatly indebted to them, and pointing out the ridiculous features of animal and idol worship. It is especially noteworthy that he claims Abraham taught the Egyptians astrology, betraying the favor which astral learning enjoyed among the Egyptian Jews of the first century B.C.

In answer to the heathen calumnies the Jews not only pointed to their history, their Scriptures, their law, the high esteem in which they were regarded by the better sort of pagans themselves, but gave examples of their wisdom, their heroism, their philanthropy. In refutation of the charge that they were traitors they called attention to their patent practice of praying daily for the Emperor, though, as Josephus records them as saying (*B.J.* ii. 10. 4) when they protested against Petronius erecting the Emperor Gaius' statue in the Temple at Jerusalem: "For the Emperor and the Roman people we offer sacrifice thrice a day, but he will have to slaughter the whole Jewish people before he can erect this statue; they are ready to offer themselves and their wives and children there in sacrifice." Against the charge of misanthropy Philo reminds the accusers that the Jews forbid abortion and the exposure of infants, and love even animals.[1] Nothing was more often remarked by the pagans than that the Jews were atheists, not worshiping the gods, and nothing was so emphatically denied by the Jews, and in their apology they took advantage of the opportunity to instruct their readers in lessons of love to God, the Father of all, to all mankind; mercy, purity, faithfulness, piety, and every virtue. Much, if not all, of Philo's work was apologetic, but directly so were his great treatises *Against Flaccus*, and *On the Legation to Caius*. These two works became models for Christians to imitate, and following Philo's example the Christian apologists, almost

[1] Friedlaender, *Gesch. jued. Apol.*, p. 278.

without exception during the second century, addressed their apologies to the emporer. The much discussed treatise of Philo on the Therapeutae or *The Contemplative Life*, is clearly shown by Wendland[1] to be apologetic. Wendland, in that pioneer investigation of this field, also points out that Philo was not entirely original in his work, but had freely used the polemic against idolatry made by early Greek writers, especially the academic skeptics. Philo's fascinating portrayal of the beauty of such a life as he imagines (?) the Therapeutae, or "the élite of the Jewish spiritualists," were leading, was doubtless the suggestion and the source of similar descriptions of Christian life in the apologies of Aristides and Athenagoras and the Letter to Diagnetus, and all the Christian apologies almost without exception. It has already been briefly indicated that the Christian apologists and theologians were greatly indebted to the Logos doctrine of Philo, and it might be shown that Philo was in turn indebted to Greek philosophy and the mystery religions, especially the Hermetic. Not only does Philo frankly and frequently acknowledge his indebtedness to tradition, but how freely he used sources is glaringly apparent from the conflicting elements which he is not even at pains to harmonize.

This Jewish-Hellenistic traditional lore passed almost bodily to the Alexandrine Christians, and has been preserved especially by Clement.[2] It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the Christianity of Alexandria owed quite as much to Philo as Hellenic Christianity owed to Paul, or Palestinian Christianity to rabbinical Judaism.

Flavius Josephus, though writing toward the end of the first Christian century, manifestly influenced Christian apologetic. In fact he has been claimed by some to have been a Christian.[3] His great work, *The Antiquities of the Jews*, is professedly apologetic, as he acknowledges in the opening paragraph of his polemic *Against Apion*, which was extensively drawn upon by Christian apologists. His own *Life* is unmistakably apologetic in tone and quite appropriately might have been entitled "Apologia pro vita sua et suae gentis." His *Wars of the Jews* also is apologetic, inasmuch as it tries to place the responsibility for that war where it properly belonged and to demonstrate the courage and other virtues of the Jews, if not indeed to maintain that Vespasian was the fulfilment of the messianic prophecies.

[1] Paul Wendland, *op. cit.*; cf. Friedlaender, *Gesch. jued. Apol.*, pp. 230, 248, 262; "Therapeutae," pp. 695 f.

[2] Bousset, *Juedisch-christlicher Schultrieb in Alexandria und Rom*, 1915.

[3] See Krueger, p. 2.

From here it was an easy step, if indeed it was any step at all, and not rather a continuation of Jewish apologetic, for the Christians to take up the defense of the new religion.[1] And it was but to be expected that the first Christian apologetic should be the product of that Alexandrine Jewish-Hellenistic tradition which had become the Christian Heritage.

While, therefore, we find reason for the appearance of the apologies of Quadratus[2] and Aristides[3] and Justin[4] in the persecution which seems to have broken out in Asia Minor and Greece in the second century,[5] we need no such event to account for the beginning of apologetic at Alexandria, even though evidence of the outbreak of persecution there were lacking,[6] where the Jews were in such numbers, whom the Christian

[1] Geffcken, *Zwei gr. Apol.*, Introduction, *passim.*

[2] Little is known of Quadratus. Eusebius (*Chron. ad a. Abr.* 2140; *H.E.* 4. 4) says he was a disciple of the apostles, gifted with prophecy (cf. Zahn, *For., G.N.T.K.*, VI [1900], 41 ff.), who (apparently in Asia Minor) addressed an apology for Christianity to the Emperor Hadrian, presumably on one of his visits to Asia Minor in the year 124 or 129. Only a brief fragment of the apology is extant (Goodspeed, *A.A.*, p. 1) complaining that the Christians are calumniated by wicked men, and maintaining in proof of the resurrection of Christ that some of those who saw him risen lived even to the writer's day (cf. Bardenhewer, *G.A.L.*, I, 168 f.).

[3] Of Aristides, a philosopher of Athens, who according to Eusebius (*Chron. ad. a. Abr.* 2140; *H.E.* 4.4) addressed an apology for Christianity to the Emperor Hadrian, little more was known than of Quadratus till the Syriac version of his *Apology* was found in 1889, and by means of this the Greek was at least in great part recognized in the Barlaam and Joasaph romance, cc. 26–27. An excellent reconstructed edition of all that is left of Aristides' *Apology* will be found in Goodspeed's *A.A.*, pp. 3 f. Cf. Bardenhewer, *G.A.G.*, I, 171, and the literature there given; also Geffcken, *Zwei gr. Apol., op. cit.*

[4] Justin Martyr, from Flavia Neopolis, had been studying the philosophy of various schools when he became a Christian, probably about the time of the Jewish war, and shortly after wrote his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* (132–35). He continued wearing his philosopher's mantle and teaching philosophy in Rome, where he was martyred about the year 163 or 167. His great apology is addressed to Antoninus Pius (138–61). In chap. 46 he says, "Christ was born 150 years ago." To this he wrote a shorter apology or appendix. The text is given in Goodspeed, *A.A.*, pp. 26–265. For literature see Bard., *G.A.L.*, I, 190 f.

[5] Eusebius (*H.E.* 4. 26, 5–11; Goodspeed, *A.A.*, p. 309) quotes from the *Apology* of Melito from Sardis, reminding Marcus Aurelius that Hadrian had put a stop to Christian persecution in Asia Minor and in Larissa, Thessalonica, Athens, and other cities of Greece.

[6] Next to nothing is known about Christianity in Egypt till late in the second century, nor is there any historic ground for supposing Christian apologetic to have been provoked in Egypt by violent opposition. The much disputed *Disputatio*

apologists assert to have been everywhere the instigators of persecution against Christians, as they appear in Acts and the Martyrdom of Polycarp. It was not surprising, therefore, since Christianity was under the same charges as Judaism of atheism, misanthropy, immorality, murder, that these four "accusations" (*enklēmata*) were the ones the Christian apologists most commonly essayed to refute, and in their refutation insisted first of all upon the Christian worship of one God, invisible, and with all the other attributes Christians had learned from Jews and Greeks. Indeed it is surprising—or is it?—that we find so little in early Christian apologetic that is really new!

We should not, then, be surprised to find that the "Beginnings of Christian Apologetic" are the continuation of Jewish and Greek, following and recording the beginnings of Christianity in its rapid assimilation and renovation of all the age was demanding for its new religion, leaving it to the theologians of the third and following centuries to systematize this vast amalgamation of multifarious elements into a harmonious whole, as the great churchmen were set the task of organizing and unifying the hordes of converted pagans into the Catholic church.

The Christianity the apologists thus essayed to defend, and defending to propagate, was not yet the harmonious teaching and smoothly working institution of later centuries. They had to fix upon some conventionally recognized representative of their common beliefs and practices, some accepted traditional channel of the doctrine and authority they held. What tradition would be more likely to commend itself than the Petrine? and what center more suitable than Rome, where that Petrine tradition had taken firm root? It is not, therefore, wonderful that the first apology for Christianity should appear as "The Preaching of Peter," stating the doctrines which "the twelve disciples," "faithful apostles," were commissioned to teach "the world."

The difference, then, between apologetic proper and the books of the canonical New Testament is not necessarily one of time; though, of course, inasmuch as the canonical books represent rather the *genesis* of Christianity than its defense, the genesis had naturally to precede the defense; still the genesis is really never ending, and there may have been call for defense in the earliest days of Christianity's genetic develop-

---

Jasonis Hebraei Christiani et Papisci Alexandrini Judaei, cited by Celsus (Origen *Contra Celsum* 4. 51), attributed to Ariston of Pella by Maximus Confessor (*Scholi in Dion. Areop. De myst. theol.* 1. 3; *M.P.G.* 4. 4. 21), was probably, like Justin's *Dialogue with the Jew Trypho*, a fictitious discussion which had no historic connection with Alexandria.

ment. Moreover, the New Testament books, as they now appear, are probably not all in their original form, and a primitive apology, such as the K.P. seems to be, might have been written before such a theological treatment of Christianity as, for instance, the Fourth Gospel. Again, as apologetic need not, and really never does, confine its attention to defense, but also instructs and even advances the constructive evolution of the religion it is defending—witness for instance the constructive evolution of theology, the idea of-God, the divinity of Christ, dogmatic expression of belief, in second-century apologetic—so also such genetic literature as the New Testament books need not, and certainly do not, exclude apologetic elements. After all, it is really a matter of *relative preponderance of apologetic* or genetic elements that characterize and classify the treatise, and this dominant element is discerned primarily in the *appeal to its audience;* the apologetic designating its audience as, in some measure at least, opposed to the subject-matter, which is therefore to be defended, not simply stated or explained or amplified. The test, therefore, to be applied to determine whether a given treatise is of apologetic or genetic character is, *What is the attitude of the audience to which it appeals?*

Applying this test to the New Testament books, we cannot mistake their character as genetic treatises on Christianity addressed to an audience already in sympathy with the subject-matter. And yet it must be admitted that, even though addressed to those who are already Christians, the New Testament, as has ever been recognized, is perhaps the most efficient apologetic. This additional effectiveness, however, does not change the primary character of the genetic treatise. Considering the developmental character of Christianity, we might even go so far as to maintain that a treatise on Christianity would not be genetic, or have any right to exist at all, did it entirely exclude the apologetic element. Surely the Fourth Gospel is addressed to Christian readers, and appreciation of that Gospel's depth and beauty and value increases with Christian experience. Yet, how clear the tone of apology sounds in it! What an irresistible appeal it must have made to the Greek who was "of God"! It implies that a demand was felt in certain Christian circles for a restatement of what Jesus meant to the believer, a restatement in the thought and language and tone of a Christian community which the demonology of Mark and the prophetic appeal of Matthew no longer fully satisfied. The presupposition is granted that Jesus is God. But what does this mean in the language of the Greek who thinks in terms of the Logos? "To recast Christian thinking, anxious to conserve

whatever was distinctive and essential in it," was, as Scott expresses it, "the purpose and theology" of the author of the Fourth Gospel (p. 355).

> He goes back to the facts of gospel history, and seeks to present them to his contemporaries as the eternal basis of their faith. The reconstruction of doctrine is everywhere subsidiary to this practical purpose of affirming once for all the supreme value of the historical revelation in Jesus . . . . Jesus was the Word, the final and absolute revelation of God to men. But His earthly appearance, instead of exhausting the revelation, was only the beginning of it [p. 375].

He is not unmindful of the problems that may be in his reader's mind, and he takes cognizance of the errors that are rife in his environment. He becomes the apologist for the moment, but only because his reader for the moment is viewed as his possible opponent. He even views himself as his opponent, as Justin, the great apologist, enters into debate with himself while ostensibly refuting Trypho's supposed objection that Christians are making of Jesus "another god," and the apologist has to pause to regain his grip on himself before he can proceed to attack his adversary.

The Acts of the Apostles, too, is to such an extent apologetic that one might reasonably suppose the "most excellent Theophilus" to be a heathen whom the writer was trying to convert, but for the reference to "the former treatise," written that Theophilus "might know the truth of those things in which he had been catechized" (L. 1:4).

In spite, therefore, of the abundant apologetic material in the New Testament books, they are quite evidently addressed to Christian readers, and so not properly apologies. Similarly, in spite of the catechetical (if so it may be called) element in such treatises as Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* or Athenagoras' *Supplication for the Christians*, these are plainly apologetic.

Applying the test of audience to the K.P., we cannot mistake its character. Fragmentary as it lies before us, it nevertheless unmistakably appeals to those who are uncertain whether there be one God, or of what nature he is; whether they should worship him as do the Jews; whether it is right to worship idols and animals and offer them sacrifice; whether there is any proof for the Christians' claim that they alone worship God aright; and who and what is Christ. The work is plainly of primitive character, and the writer considers his audience at least willing hearers. He even seems to take it for granted that they are listening to and accepting his words, "holily and justly learning what he

has delivered to them," and are waiting to be told what to do "to be saved." He is not remonstrating with the heathen, as, for instance, Tatian is, inviting defeat by abusive harshness. Nor is he pleading with unjust persecutors, as is Justin in his *Apology* to the Emperor. His audience, we should surmise, is one in which Jews and Egyptian Hellenists, not entirely unacquainted with Christianity, listen reasonably to his appeal, yet demand proof of what he says, proof especially from those sacred Scriptures they have already learned to revere and trust.

IV

COMMENTARY ON THE FRAGMENTS

1. *Name.*—The word *kērygma* is common throughout the range of Greek literature, from Herodotus (3. 52; 5. 92; 6. 78, etc.) to the present, meaning "that which is cried by a herald or crier," "a proclamation," "public notice" (Liddell-Scott, *Gk.-Eng. Lex.*); "*preaching*, particularly *the preaching of the Gospel*" (Sophocles, *Gr.-Eng. Lex.*, Roman and Byzantine Periods), in which meaning it occurs frequently in the New Testament (I Cor. 1:21; 2:4; 15:14; Rom. 16:25; Mk. 12:4; L. 11:32; Jo. 3:4; II Tim. 4:17; Tit. 1:3, Grimm) and in Christian literature generally. It derives from the verb *kēryssein*, "to be, officiate as, a herald"; "to proclaim"; "to preach." Cognate words are: *kērygmos*, *kēryxis*, the act of proclaiming or preaching; *kērykeia*, the office of a herald or preacher, etc. The root word is *kēryx*, "a herald," "public messenger," "ambassador" (Lat. *praeco*, *legatus*), frequent in Homer. "From the heroic times their office was sacred and their persons inviolable, as being under the immediate protection of Jupiter" (L.-S.). Hermes was the *kēryx* of the gods. Cf. I Clem. 5:6, applied to Paul. In our fragments *kērygma* plainly means "Preaching" in the sense of that which is preached, like the Italian *predica*. Hence it was easily confused with "teaching," that which is taught, *didaskalia*, and translated into Latin *doctrina* as well as *praedicatio*.

The name "Peter." "In the early part of the second century," says Professor Goodspeed,[1] "various books were written in Christian circles about the Apostle, or even in his name, until one could have collected a whole New Testament bearing his name. There were a Gospel of Peter, Acts of Peter, the Teaching of Peter, the Preaching of Peter, the Epistles of Peter, and the Revelation of Peter. Most of these laid claim to being from the pen of Peter himself."

The writer of the *kērygma* says (IX): "We, opening the books we have of the Prophets," etc., and Clement says he is speaking of the apostles. Does it necessarily follow from this that the writer claimed to be Peter the Apostle? Elsewhere (VI), the writer seems to imply plainly enough that he is *not* one of "the apostles" to whom Jesus said, "I have chosen you twelve," etc. The writer of the Acts of the Apostles

[1] *The Story of the New Testament*, p. 134.

says (6:2): "It is not fitting that we," etc., merely quoting Peter in the first person, without at all pretending that the writer is Peter! Origen (*Hom. X in Lev.*) refers to "a certain little book *Ab apostolis dictum*," and (*De princ. praef.* 8), probably referring to the same "little book," says: "First it is to be answered that that little book is not numbered among ecclesiastical (canonical?) books, and *it is to be shown* that neither is it a writing of Peter, nor of anyone else who was inspired by the spirit of God." Does he mean that Origen intends "to show" this? He wrote these works before 218 A.D. (Harnack, *Chronale*, II [1904], 30 f.). But he is still promising, when he wrote book xiii of his commentary on John, "to make a careful investigation also concerning that little book, whether it be genuine or spurious or mixt." He is apparently no better informed than he was years before, though he knows Heracleon's quotation of the K.P. is "often repeated," and himself repeats it in a rather negligent way. His quotation (or quotations?) is second hand. Why did he not quote directly? Why did he defer his promised investigation? Had he the K.P. at all? Had he ever seen it? It would be interesting to know whether Origen really knew anything about the K.P. more than what he had read in Clement and heard of Heracleon and others! If our only reason for thinking the K.P. writer wished to pose as the apostle Peter is Clement's manner of introducing his words and Origen's second-hand hearsay hasty remarks, it were better to leave the question open. Had the writer wished to pretend to be Peter the Apostle, he would not likely have written of the apostles in the third person. This is not the fashion of the other plainly pretentious works of "Peter."

The Gospel of Peter (e.g., 14:59) says: "We, the twelve disciples," and (60): "I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my Brother." And I Peter, even if the pretentious preamble be considered a later addition, quite plainly implies that the writer claims to be Peter, writing from Rome ("Babylon"), and sending greetings of "his son Mark" (5:13)—unless, indeed, 5:12–14 also be a later addition: 5:11 being a very appropriate ending. Also II Peter, apart from the preamble, implies that the writer claims to be one of those who were with Jesus at the Transfiguration (1:17–18; cf. Mt. 17:5); who is soon to die, as "the Lord Jesus Christ had foretold" (1:14; cf. Jo. 21:18–19); and promises to provide that they will have after his death a record (*mnēmēn*) of these things (1:15), presumably some such record as the Acts of Peter. The writer of the Apocalypse of Peter does not give his name in any of the extant fragments, though he speaks as one of Jesus' disciples: "And we were

praying" (c. 3); " and I came near to the Lord and said to him . . . . and he said to me" (c. 4). Yet according to Clement: "*Peter*, in the Apocalypse, says," etc. (*Ecl. Proph.* 48, 49). Had Clement better reason than we for attributing the Apocalypse to Peter?

It is not, of course, necessary that a writer give his name. Anonymous writing was very common at this time. Nor do we, as a rule, find a writer giving his name without reason. Such anxious insistence upon recognition as that, for instance, which the writer of the Gospel of Peter, betrays, is suspicious; it makes one feel uneasy, lest the writer be not really who he pretends to be. Might it not be that Clement speaks of "Peter saying in the Kērygma," as we might speak of "Homer saying in the *Odyssey*," though we are well aware the writer nowhere reveals his identity, and we may feel very certain that Homer never said any such thing? Justin (*Dial.* 106. 3), after mentioning Peter, says: "And it is written in his memoirs" (apparently meaning Mk. 3:16–17). Might it not be that the writer of the K.P. no more wished to pass for Peter than the writer of the *Apology* of Socrates wished to pass for Socrates? Without venturing to solve the problem, the present writer would suggest the opinion that the Kērygma was first in current circulation as a faithful representation of that preaching for which the apostolic source was Peter, just as what was later known as the Gospel of Mark was first in circulation as a faithful representation of the gospel of Jesus, for which the apostolic source was Peter, and was referred to by Justin as such. Later the title "The Gospel according to Mark" was affixed to it. Similarly, "the Preaching of Peter" was affixed to the Kērygma.

2. *Relation of the K.P. to the other writings of Peter.*—It has been shown that there is some similarity and generally admitted relation between the K.P. and the five old writings known as the Gospel of Peter, the Acts of Peter, the First and Second Epistles of Peter, and the Apocalypse of Peter. It should be remarked that in their present form, which, at least in the case of Acts of Peter, is certainly not the original, the date of origin is difficult to determine with anything like certainty. Approximately the Apocalypse may be dated, say, 120 A.D.; the Gospel before 200 A.D.; the Acts about 200 A.D.; the First Epistle in Domitian's reign (81–96 A.D.); the Second Epistle about the same time as the first appearance of the Acts of Peter (cf. II Pet. 1:15), or some new edition of those Acts. But these dates are merely "approximations" of a very loose kind. There is nothing in the Apocalypse of Peter to determine its date narrowly. It might have been written toward the end of the

first century. It has already been remarked that portions of the Gospel of Peter (e.g., 1:1; 11:45–46, compared with Mt. 27:24, 54) impress one as primitive. However, since the earliest definite evidence extant of the existence of the Gospel of Peter is what Eusebius relates (*H.E.* 6. 12, 3–6): that Serapion of Antioch (*ca.* 200 A.D.) found on one of his episcopal visitations among the Christian community at Rhossus "a Gospel under the name of Peter," and objected to its reading; and later found the same Gospel among a "Docetic" community of Antioch (and it does contain expressions apparently Docetic); there is not sufficient proof to date it earlier than the middle of the second century.[1] The Muratorian Fragment,[2] generally dated about 200 A.D., says the Apocalypse of Peter was received, though some did not wish to have it read in church. The M.F. reference to the Acts, mentioning the martyrdom of Peter and Paul's journey to Spain, may mean the "Actus Petri c. Sim." (VI) in which these events are related, but not in the Lucan Acts.[3] The First Epistle of Peter was probably written in Domitian's reign, and its style is so much like that of the Epistles to the Hebrews, the most elegant in the New Testament, and of the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, that it has been plausibly maintained that they are from the same author.[4] The prominent individuality of the writer, and of what type he was, can best be observed by a careful reading of the Epistle, and an analysis of its thought and language, its purpose, destination, and provenence. Origen (Euseb. *H.E.* vi. 14. 1–4) comments at some length on the style of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and says: "The tradition has come down to us that Clement the Bishop of the Romans wrote the Epistle." Jacquier (I, 482) concludes:

> Du texte même de l'épître et des études que nous venons de faire sur l'histoire, la langue et les doctrines de l'épître aux Hébreux nous dégagerons les caractères suivants. L'écrivan de l'épître était Juif [his reason for this seems to be the writer's familiarity with the LXX!], crétien, de la génération sub-apostolique, et connaissait bien les saintes Écritures; il était disciple de saint Paul et avait lu attentivement les épîtres pauliennes; peut-être même avait-il reçu directement les enseignments de l'apôtre. Il connaissait peut-être le troisième évangile, les Actes des Apôtres et la première épître de saint

[1] Cf. C. Schmidt, *T.U.*, XXIV, 1.

[2] Zahn, *G.N.T.K.*[2] (1890), pp. 5 f. Jacquier, *Le Nouveau Testament dans l'église* (Paris, 1911), I, 189 f.

[3] Jacquier, *Histoire des livres du Nouveau Testament*, III[3], 246–79; I[8] (1908), 448, 451, 485.

[4] Jacquier, III, 281; Harnack, *G.A.L. Chron.*, I (1897), 463.

Pierre [his reason for this is the striking similarity of the two epistles, priority being conceded to the first Peter on account of its name]. Pour les écrits de Philon, c'est plus douteux; cépendent *il a subi les mêmes influences que lui et son éducation a été plutôt alexandrine* que palestinienne.

This description would fit the author of I Peter quite as well. Of the two epistles Jacquier says (III, 280): "Bien qu'on puisse supposer que *la même langue* chrétienne etait *cummune aux deux évrivains*, les ressemblances sont trop nombreuses pour qu'on ne soit pas oblige d'admettre que saint Clément s'est inspiré de la première épître de saint Pierre."

It would take us too far away from our theme to pursue this comparison of I Peter, Hebrews, and I Clement, but a reading of the three epistles will reveal such striking resemblances in thought, language, and *purpose* that we are tempted to think that if they had not the same author, their authors were in familiar intercourse. The language, especially of I Peter and I Clement, is so teasingly similar, yet not identical, the thought and purpose so identical, yet slightly different in expression, that different authors could hardly have known each other's minds so perfectly and have expressed each other's thought so precisely without copying the identical words. Compare Heb. 13:7, 17, 24, with I Pet. 5:15, and I Clem. 1:3; 63:3; the oft recurring doxology: I Pet. 4:11; 5:11; I Clem. 13:21; 64, end; 65:2; Heb. 13:21; the church and hierarchy, authority and discipline, centering in Rome, where Peter planted the faith with his blood: Heb., 5:12 f.; I Pet. 5:13; I Clem. 1:1; 5:3–7; 44:2–4. Obviously some great churchman is coaxing on the Roman community, reminding it that it has "to be taught," when it "ought to be teaching others" (Heb. 5:12); and in the same style and tone the response comes (I Pet. 1:1) "to the elect (churches) of the dispersion" from "their coelect church in Babylon" (Rome, I Pet. 5:9): "to honor all men, to love the brotherhood, to fear God, to honor the king" (I Pet. 2:17). Read in the echo of the Ephesian prophet's ravings against the "Beast" and "the Harlot of Babylon," these words have a telling significance. "In fine," it pleads with them to be "all of one mind, sympathetic, fraternal, kind, modest, humble; not rendering evil for evil, nor curse for curse, but rather blessing, for to this they are called, to inherit a blessing" (3:9); that if "doing good they suffer patiently, it will be pleasing to God: for to this they are called; for Christ suffered for us, leaving them an example to follow, who committed no sin, in whose mouth no guile was found; who when cursed did not curse back, when he suffered he did not threaten, but surrendered himself to the one who judged him according to law

(*dikaiōs*)" (2:21–24). It is "the Church of God resident at Rome" (I Clem. 1:1), following "the good apostles," Peter and Paul (5:3–6), reprimanding the other churches for disorderliness or impatience under trial, mellowing the rebuke out of consideration for the afflicted, yet speaking with no uncertain meaning and authority, authority based, then as ever since, upon the Roman bishop's succession to Peter, the Prince of the Apostles.

The very title of I Peter is significant, though not much weight can be rested on it, for Polycarp certainly knew the epistle (cf. Pol. 1. 3 with I Pet. 1:8; Pol. 1. 3: I Pet. 1:12; Pol. 2. 13. 21; 5. 3: I Pet. 2. 11), and quoted it six times *without name*. The writer, however, as the epistle now reads, with the introduction and conclusion, plainly pretends to be St. Peter, the apostle, in precisely the same way that the author of II Peter does. Compare the reference in I Peter (5:14) to "my son Mark," with the reference in II Peter (3:15) to "our dearest brother Paul." The absence in Hebrews and I Clement of such attempts to identify the author would alone make them suspicious in I Peter. Could they have escaped Polycarp had they been in the copies he used? It would seem reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the name of Peter attached itself to this Epistle some time between Polycarp's writing to the Philippians in Trajan's time (*ca.* 110?) and the writing of II Peter, which could not have been much before 200 A.D., and probably, since it is not mentioned, after the Muratorian Canon (200 A.D.).

This II Peter is the one Petrine writing that has unconcealably an axe to grind. The writer is painfully anxious to be identified with him to whom the Lord Jesus foretold his death, and he is certain that his death is near, and he is in haste to make sure that they will have a *record of his death* (II Pet. 1:14–15). He is going to begin right away to admonish them (1:12). He reminds them he has not followed "learned fables," but "the power (*dynamis*) and manifestation (*parousian*) of our Lord Jesus Christ; having been an *initiate* (*epoptai*) of his greatness (1:16–18), in the Transfiguration." "And we have this very firm *prophetic treatise* (*propheticon logon* [the Apocalypse of Peter?]), to which you would do well to attend, as to a torch lighting your way through a dark place, until the day dawns, and the morning star rises in your hearts; understanding this first of all that no *prophecy of Scripture* comes by private interpretation. For *prophecy* was never given at human demand but holy men of God spoke inspired of the Holy Spirit" (1:19–21). How anxious he is that they accept "this prophetic treatise" which he is recommending as the inspired word of God! Then he goes

on to warn them against false prophets, takes a generous piece out of the Epistle of Jude, rather harshly stigmatizes certain heretics, and continues (3:1 ff.): "Behold this *second* Epistle I write to you." He wants to be sure they identify him with the writer of I Peter. Evidently, then, there is *already* an epistle current under the name of Peter. Note the implied time in 3:4: "Where is the promise of his coming? *Since the fathers died*, everything goes on as from the beginning of creation." He seems to refer to some writing in 3:1–2; and indicates that the purpose of this second epistle is "that I may arouse your sincere mind; that you may be mindful of the words I have already spoken (*proeirēmenōn rhēmatōn*) from the holy Prophets and your Apostles' command from the Lord and Savior." This reference to "word from the Prophets" and "the Lord's command of the Apostles" would quite well apply to the Preaching of Peter.

The Second Epistle of Peter[1] is too well acquainted with "all the Epistles of Paul" (3:16) and other Christian literature to be very early, and its introduction of the "Acts of Peter," if that is what is meant by "the record of his death," would indicate about the year 200 A.D. as the date of writing.

From the foregoing discussion it seems that the basis of the recognized relation between these old Petrine writings is the Petrine tradition of the Roman church; that this tradition lay behind the three great epistles of the late first century—Hebrews, I Peter, and I Clement; that it gave authority and recommendation to the Preaching of Peter; that it gave the occasion for or at least embodied the Apocalypse of Peter early in the second century; that it was invoked late in the second century by the Docetic Gospel of Peter; that it was often recast in the ramifications of the Acts of Peter; that the promulgation of one edition of these Acts was the occasion of the Second Epistle of Peter about the end of the second century, which ingeniously combines all these writings to commend itself and the Acts it is promulgating; that the First Epistle of Peter was, like Hebrews and I Clement, anonymously written, but got the name of Peter attached to it between Polycarp and II Peter.

To trace this Petrine tradition farther back we must investigate its connection with the Peter-Mark tradition and the provenance of the Gospel of Mark.

[1] Cf. G. Wohlenberg, *Petrusbrief und Judasbrief* (Zahn's *Kommentar zur N.T.*, XV), 1 and 2, 1915. Spitta, *Der zweite Brief des Petrus und der Brief des Judas*, Halle, 1885.

There are varying traditions about Mark (see *Acta Sanctorun* xi. 346 ff.). Jerome (*De vir.* iii. 8), says: "Mortuus est octavo Neronis anno et sepultus Alexandriae." This is probably, as usually, nothing better than an amplification of Eusebius' remark (*H.E.* ii. 16. 24) which says that Mark was succeeded in that year by Anianus as bishop of Alexandria. The *Acta Marci* and the *Chronicon Pascale* say he was dragged to death. The Roman Martyrology commemorates him as a martyr, on April 25, at Alexandria. A later tradition transfers his relics to Venice. He is first connected with Alexandria by Epiphanius (*Haer.* 51. 6) and Eusebius (*H.E.* ii. 16. 24). Origen and Clement make no allusion to any connection between Mark and Alexandria, which is a very strong *argumentum ex silentio*. Could it be that Mark's connection with Alexandria was effected through the Petrine Tradition? It has been noted with Jacquier that there is a strong undercurrent of Alexandrine thought and language in the three Epistles—Hebrews, I Peter, and Clement—for which Jacquier accounts by supposing that *Clement's* education was Alexandrine. The close relation of these Epistles with Clement makes this possibility tremendously important for our investigation of the place of origin of the K.P., which all indications seem to trace to Alexandria. The same Petrine tradition which connected Mark with Peter, or Peter with Mark, in Rome, functioned in a similar manner at Alexandria.[1] The tradition appears in several forms. In substance it runs: when Peter was preaching in Rome, his hearers asked Mark, who had been Peter's companion and interpreter, to put into writing for them what the apostle had preached. The result was the Gospel of Mark. This happened, "praedicante Petro evangelium palam Romae," according to a supposed work of Clement of Alexandria (*Adumbrationes in I Petri*) quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* vi. 14). According to Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 3. 1) the writing was done "after the departure (exodon) of these" —Peter and Paul, apparently meaning their death. Papias, quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* iii. 39. 15), says he learned from "the Presbyter" that

[1] Chrysostom (*Hom. in Mt.* 3) says Mark wrote in Egypt. This is probably an erroneous interpretation of the tradition recorded by Eusebius (*H.E.* ii. 16): "Mark went to Egypt and there preached the Gospel he had written, and himself founded the first Christian community in Alexandria. So great was the number of men and women first converted who led a chaste and strict life that finally Mark's companion and helper praised in writing their diligence, community life, festivities, and the whole manner of their life." In the following chapter, Eusebius dwells at length upon Philo and his Therapeutae. This mistaking of Philo for a companion of Mark and the Therapeutae for Christians by the "Father of Church History" is remarkable.

"Mark, having been Peter's interpreter, wrote carefully what he remembered (not however in order) was said and done by the Lord, for he had neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but afterwards, as I said, Peter as much as was needed confirmed the teaching." What seems to have happened was that the Gospel of Mark appeared in Rome shortly after the death of Peter, and that Mark was the authority for its correctness, and through Mark it was connected with Peter. See Bacon (*Is Mark a Roman Gospel?*, p. 39):

> Either, then, this primitive Gospel [Mark] must have emanated from some center of very great authority and importance with or without the important sanction of an alleged derivation from Peter; or we are at a loss to account for the dominant position it acquired in every region of the early church to which our knowledge extends. Such an authoritative center of emanation might be Rome . . . . Jerusalem . . . . Antioch. But Antioch, like Ephesus and Jerusalem, has a Gospel of its own, and yet uses Mark.

Further he says (p. 45), after remarking that the Jerusalem church preferred traditional teaching to writing:

> The result was that the first widely circulated Gospels, properly so-called, were Greek, though they rest on a Semitic foundation. The Aramaic compositions of which we have actual knowledge through surviving fragments and reports by the Fathers are without exception later than the Greek and based upon them.

The prominence of Peter in early Christian tradition, art, and literature certainly justifies this appeal to his authority as the source of the first written Gospel; and the intimate relation of Mark to Peter would substantiate the probability that this first Gospel linked up with Peter's preaching through Mark; and the death of Peter in Rome and the abundant documentary evidence of Mark's presence there, would designate Rome as the place where Mark's Gospel appeared. The Acts of the Apostles narrates much concerning Peter in Jerusalem and Palestine after the crucifixion. When delivered from prison by the angel, according to Acts (12:12) he goes "to the house of Mary the mother of John, who is called Mark, where many were gathered, and praying," and tells them (12:17) how "the Lord led him out of prison, and said: 'Tell James and the brethren these things.' And going out he went to another place." Barnabas and Saul came to Jerusalem, apparently about this time (Acts 12:25), with alms sent from Antioch to relieve the poor at Jerusalem apparently during the famine "which occurred under Claudius" (Acts 11:28–30). This date is generally

supposed in church tradition to be 42 A.D., or *twelve years* after the crucifixion. That the Acts of the Apostles purposely holds the apostles in Jerusalem for "twelve years," even when "all are dispersed . . . . *except* the apostles" (Acts 8:1), is significant (cf. K.P. VI). That Peter preached in Pontus, etc. (I Pet. 1:1), that he was in Antioch seven years, in Rome twenty-five, and was martyred under Nero, A.D. 67, are traditions more or less contradictory, and do not concern us here. That Peter preached in Palestine and Syria is told us by the Acts; that he was martyred in Rome there is abundant evidence. That Mark was with Peter is, in Bacon's opinion, supported by Acts, chapters 10–12; 13:13; 15:38; Col. 4:10; Gal. 2:10. Cf. also Philemon 24; I Pet. 5:14.[1]

[1] After writing the above, the writer has made the acquaintance of Professor S. J. Case's very ingenious hypothesis of two main questions at issue between the three so-called parties of the early Christian church, which throws helpful light upon the Petrine tradition and our problems. According to Professor Case's hypothesis, the question at issue in Gal. 2:1–10 was the admission of gentile converts to Christianity without circumcision. In the Antiochene community, composed so largely of gentile converts, there was no difficulty in doing this, for the simple reason that it was the only reasonable thing to do. However, certain zealots of the law from Jerusalem started disturbance, and Paul and Barnabas, accompanied by Mark, taking Titus as a test case, went up to Jerusalem to have an understanding with James and the rest "who seemed to be something" (Acts 15:2; 12:25; Gal. 2:2–3). This was about the time of the famine, mentioned in Acts 11:28, under Claudius, and the death of Herod Agrippa (Acts 12:23; 44 A.D.); which event may also account for Peter's liberation from prison (Acts 12:7–17). The "other place" (Acts 12:17), to which Peter went after obtaining his freedom from prison, was probably Antioch, where we find him in Gal. 2:11. By this time a new problem was in the making at Antioch, solved there in the same reasonable and only way as the one about circumcision had been solved, namely of Jewish Christians eating with uncircumcised converts to Christianity. Even Peter, "before certain ones came from James, ate with gentiles. But when they had come he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those who were of the circumcision. And to his simulation other Jews also agreed, so that even Barnabas was led into that simulation. But when I saw," says Paul, "that they were not walking straight to the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas in the presence of all: 'If you, though you are a Jew, live like a heathen (*ethnikōs*), and not like a Jew, how do you compel Gentiles to judaize?'" (Gal. 2:11–14). This was the real cause of separation between Barnabas and Paul (Acts 15:39). Paul uncompromisingly contended for Christian fellowship between Jewish and gentile converts, even at table. Peter and Barnabas and Mark (Acts 15:37), giving in to the demand of James and the Jerusalem community, refrained from such fellowship at table.

However, the rupture was not a violent one, and the apostles continued their friendly co-operation, only agreeing to allow each his own field of labor. From this time on, Paul leaves Antioch and Syria to Peter, and shifts his own base of missionary operations to Greece or Macedonia. Peter continued his preaching down the coast of Syria. It was during this time that he had such experience as that related in

The writing of Mark was probably first known as "the memoirs" (*apomnēmoneumata*) as Justin apparently quotes it (*Dial.* 106. 3). The word *evangelion* was in common use, meaning "a reward for good news," or "the good news" itself. Its use by Paul had given it a special meaning as the good news of Jesus' preaching, Possibly it was Mark's use of the word (1:15; 8:35; 10:29; 13:10; 14:9; 16:15) that connected it with the written "memoirs."

Acts, chapter 10, the Cornelius incident. The experience convinced him that Paul was right in insisting on table fellowship between Jewish and gentile Christians, and himself began to defend the practice. At Jerusalem, "they who were of the circumcision called him to account saying, 'Why did you go in and *eat with uncircumcised men?*'" (Acts 11:3).

The issue of this discussion was probably not so smooth as Acts, chapter 11, makes it. Nor is it likely that Paul was there. There is, however, no reason to think the rupture was so complete as some have contended. Peter and James doubtless continued friendly co-operation, just as Peter and Paul had after the affair at Antioch. But there seems to have been a similar separation between James and Peter, Peter leaving Jerusalem and Judea to James as Paul had left Antioch and Syria to Peter.

This hypothesis helps us also with the chronology of Peter's life. If the date of Paul and Barnabas' visit to Jerusalem (Acts 15:2; Gal. 2:1) was in the reign of Claudius (Acts 11:28) and before Herod's death (Acts 12:23), that is, 41–44 A.D., and time, say a year or so, is allowed to elapse between this event and Peter's arrival in Antioch (Gal. 2:11), and again, time for Peter's experience of such as the Cornelius event and his change of attitude toward the table-fellowship problem, the discussion of this problem, as related in Acts 11:3, would fall about the year 50. After this date, then, Peter, in this hypothesis, is no longer in Jerusalem, but at Antioch or in Syria. This agrees with the tradition which makes Peter the first bishop of Antioch. It would also account for the strange action of Paul, returning from his second missionary journey, "saluting the church" at Caesarea, and going on to Antioch, without going to Jerusalem (Acts 18:22). This must have been not long after 50 A.D., allowing time for the events of Acts 15:40–18, 22; 18:23–20, 38; 19:10, the Corinthian, Roman, and other correspondence. It is to be noted that, when he later went to Jerusalem, Paul was "gladly received" by the Jerusalem community (Acts 21:17), though "they were all zealous for the law" (Acts 21:20). No mention is made of Peter at this time, which would indicate that he was not in Jerusalem. After Paul had been in custody at Caesarea two years (Acts, chaps. 24, 25) Felix succeeded Fortius Festus. From Josephus Fl. (*Ant.* xx. 8. 9) it seems probable that this was early in the reign of Nero (54–68); Felix, who had been appointed by Claudius (Jos. *Ant.* xx. 7. 1), was accused by Roman nobles and brought to Rome by Nero, "and he had certainly been brought to punishment, unless Nero had yielded to the importunate solicitations of his brother Pallas, who was at that time held in the greatest honor by him" (*Ant.* xx. 8. 9.). The events related by Tacitus (*An.* 13.54; *Hist.* 5. 9) would seem to have been after this; hence Josephus says, "at that time." However, it is generally thought that the change of Felix for Festus took place about 60 A.D. The next two years (Acts 28:30) Paul was in Rome. Writing to the Colossians he sends the greetings of "Mark,

3. *The Sermons of Peter; Kerygmata, Clementina, etc.*—The association of the name of Clement of Rome with Peter was doubtless the source of the extensive Clementine Literature. The legend that Clement became Peter's companion on his missions in Syria, and, at Peter's instruction, wrote down his sermons and sent them to James, bishop of Jerusalem, formed the nucleus around which grew a variegated romance embodying "Sermons of Peter" that bear a generally recog-

---

the cousin of Barnabas, concerning whom you have received command that if he come to you you are to receive him" (Col. 4:10). Does this mean that Mark contemplated a visit to Colossa? May it not only mean that the Colossians had been put on their guard against those who differed from Paul, as Mark had in the matter of table fellowship, and that Paul wished, now that Mark agreed with him, to tell the Colossians to receive him should he ever come among them? Or are we to suspect here another recommendation of the Roman "Mark" who appears as "my son Mark" in I Pet. 5:13? Anyhow, there is no evidence that Mark ever went to Colossa, but more reason to believe that he remained in Rome. The mention of his kinship with Barnabas, and the mention of Clement (Phil. 4. 3), if it is the same Clement who, according to tradition, wrote to the Corinthians later, may be the base of the Clementine legend linking Clement with Peter through Barnabas. If this Mark is the same "John Mark" who was once with Paul and Barnabas, and whose mother Mary's house (Acts 12:12) was a gathering place of Christians in Jerusalem and well known to Peter, the friendship of Peter and Mark, which Papias has recorded, may not rest only on that writer's erroneous reading of I Pet. 5:13, as Bacon has strangely thought. Indeed, there is room for doubt, considering Polycarp's use of I Peter without naming it, that it was now circulating under the name of Peter, and possibly lacked this (5:13) passage when Papias wrote.

What Peter was doing and where he went during the time which elapsed between his leaving Jerusalem, probably about 50 A.D., and his martyrdom in Rome, which tradition dates 67 A.D., there seems no way to learn. Not much can be made of the date 67 A.D. It is only a little sum in addition: 12 years in Jerusalem plus 25 in Rome. The other seven years at Antioch, and it is not said how many in Pontus, Cappadocia, etc., would make Peter antedate Christ. However, the evidence is too abundant to question the fact that Peter died in Rome, and that this happened under Nero.

If the expression "I am of Cephas" means that there was a Petrine faction at Corinth, it would point to Peter's having been there, as Paul and Apollos, mentioned in the same connection, certainly had (I Cor. 1:12; Acts 19:1). Even if the First Epistle of Peter was not written by him, as it certainly was not, there may yet be some historic reason for the pretension that Peter had preached in "Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythinia" (I Pet. 1:1). "The Jew of Pontic race, Aquila," whom Paul met at Corinth coming from Rome, expelled by Claudius (Acts 18:2), may be an indication, however slight, that Aquila had accompanied Peter from Pontus to Rome. There was some reason why Paul refrained from going to Rome, and it was probable that some apostle, such as Peter, was there (Rom. 1:13; 15:20). But there was also some reason why he wrote to the Romans at all. Chapter 15 would seem to imply that there was a problem about food. The long list of salutations at

nized resemblance with the K.P. and may represent an elaborated form of what is referred to as the "Kerygmata" or sermons of Peter which are simply unknown, and it is the merest conjecture that they may have once existed in written form and perhaps were one of the sources used by the writer of the Acts of the Apostles. M. H. Waitz[1] has made a thorough analysis of the Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions* and concluded that the source document (which will be referred to

---

the end of the epistle, if it belongs to this epistle, may mean that Paul had made the acquaintance of many Romans at Philippi, or elsewhere on his missions, and they were entreating him to come to Rome, and he saw that he did have some right to go there, as he was the Apostle of the Gentiles. Possibly he also vaguely decried the coming ascendancy of the Roman church, and the union of his and Peter's work, which was accomplished a few decades after their death.

The legend of Peter's going to Rome to refute Simon the Magician is too varied to be of much value, though here again there must be some fire where there is so much smoke. Doubtless "Simon Magas" is more or less a convenient personification for the typical magician, and the practice of magic, of which the Gospel of Mark is evidence, at Rome, if Mark is a Roman Gospel, would of itself be sufficient grounds for bringing Peter there in legend. But the legend is just as closely, perhaps even more closely, bound up with Syrian connections—Caesarea, Tripolis, Antioch, etc. Matthew, the Syrian Gospel, while not traditionally related to Peter as Mark is, nevertheless is the one which promoted, or at least recorded, Peter's exaltation, thus affording additional evidence of Peter's prominence in Syria. May it not be that the Roman church, after the death of Peter there, cherished his memory and claimed his authority for its Gospel, Mark, and that Antioch, putting forth its own claim, extolled Peter in its Gospel, Matthew, and that later Rome and Antioch made common issue for their mutual ends against Jerusalem and Ephesus, till, after the fall of the Jerusalem church (135 A.D.), Ephesus united with Rome and Antioch, perhaps through the instrumentality of such men as Ignatius and Polycarp, and its Gospel, John, was joined to the Antiochene Matthew and Roman Mark, with the universalizing Luke added to make the triumphant Fourfold Gospel, promulgated and held together by the Lucan Acts? Would not this suggest a favorable opportunity for the interpolation, if they are interpolations, of such texts as Mt. 16:16–18; Jo. chap. 21; L., chaps. 22, 32; and Mk. 16:9–20? It would make the Roman Christian letters of Domitian's reign very opportune, and create a veritable demand for the Lucan Acts, the Ignation Letters, and Clement to the Corinthians.

Though we know regrettably so little about Alexandria at this period, there is doubtless history behind the legendary connection of Alexandria with Rome, through the Petrine-Markan tradition. This question will come up for our consideration later, but for the present it should be remarked that there is sufficient Alexandrine element in the Roman literature of this time, to indicate that the Petrine tradition is also functioning in Alexandria.

[1] On the Clementine Literature see Bardenhewer, *G.A.L.*, I, 351 ff., and M. H. Waitz, "Die Pseudoclementinen Homilien und Rekognitionen" (Leipzig, 1904), in *T.U.*, XXV, 4. The text used in this dissertation is *M.P.G.L.*

in the following discussion as K.K.) was written at a time when the world was concerned with such problems as the origin of the cosmos, and was convinced that a solution was looked for in vain from philosophy and magic, and to be found only in "the true Word or Logos" (*H.* 1. 13; *R.* 1. 10); "The true Prophet" (*H.* 1. 19; *R.* 1. 16); "the Prophet of truth" (*H.* 1. 20; *R.* 1. 17); "the prophetic announcement" (*H.* 1. 21; *R.* 1. 18). Man must believe in the true Prophet (*H.* 1. 19; *R.* 1. 16), for he has a divine revelation (*H.* 3. 20); which teaches belief in one God (*H.* 2. 12; 12. 23; *R.* 2. 36, 40, 60). "In the preaching of Peter on the journey from Caesarea to Tripolis, the writer takes up the polemic against popular beliefs of heathendom, belief in demons and gods, from which he turns to belief in one God and Baptism (*H.* 7–11; *R.* 4–6) just as a catechist might prepare a catechumen for baptism" (p. 49). "So gibt sich die Schrift als eine Apologie bezw. Polemik des Christentums gegen Haeresie und Heidentum, im weitesten sinn des Wortes" (p. 50). He summarizes the contents of the supposed original document (p. 52), in which he thinks there were no Judaizing tendencies and is of the opinion that it was written in Rome about 150 A.D. (p. 61). The sources of this original document (pp. 77 ff.) he thinks were the K.K. The *H.R.* attained their present form 220–30 A.D. (p. 366).

While it seems the Clementina are the outgrowth of the same tradition of Peter's preaching which supplied the Acts of the Apostles and the K.P. with material, that original element has been lost beyond recovery or recognition in the mass of shifting romance which has reached us. The passages which seem more likely to contain remnants of the original kerygma are *H.* 10. 16; *R.* 5. 20; *H.* 17. 7; *H.* 10. 9; *R.*5.30; *H.* 10, 25.

4. *Other Fragments, more or less probable.*—Frag. XI[1] very probably belongs to the K.P., "Doctrina" being really a good translation of

[1] Frag. XI, Orig. *De princ. praef.* 8. "Appellatio autem asomaton, id est incorporei, non solum apud multos alios verumetiam apud nostras Scripturas est inusitata et incognita. Si vero quis velit nobis proferre ex illo libello qui Petri Doctrina appellatur ubi Salvator videtur ad discipulos dicere: Non sum daemonium incorporeum? primo respondendum est ei, quoniam ille liber inter ecclesiasticos non habetur, et ostendendum quia neque Petri est ipsa Scriptura, neque alterius cujusdam, qui Spiritu Dei fuerit inspiratus." Cf. Dob., pp. 82 and 134.

Cf. *Ignatius ad Smyrn.* 3. 1–2, certainly not his own words. Cf. Jerome *De vir. illustr.* iii. 16, and Klostermann (*Apoc.*, II, Ev. 2, p. 8), who thinks this passage belongs to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Also Preuschen, *Anteleg.*, I, 8.

Cf. the Apocalypse of Peter II, Copt. (Schmidt, *T.U.*, VIII, 1, p. 2): "The Lord came to us: 'Come and . . . . you, Peter, who thrice denied me . . . . do you still deny me?' We ran to him, though in our hearts we doubted that it was true. He said

kērygma, better in fact than "Praedicatio." Frag. XII.[1] This "libellus" is doubtless the same one that Origen (*De princ. praef.* 8) calls "Doctrina Petri," and with the same great probability is to be identified with the K.P. Frag. XIII[2] has no claim to kinship with the K.P. either in name or resemblance. "Epistula" cannot by any stretch of the imagination be construed to mean "*Kērygma.*" "Nolite judicare fratres vestros" would sound very strange in an apologetic like the K.P. Frag. XIV[3] and XV[4] are very like the K.P. fragments which Clement quotes by name, and would fit in an apologetic of the character the K.P. apparently is. The name "didaskalia Petrou" is apparently not a mistake for *kērygma*, occurring as it does more than once, nor could the Latin "Doctrina" intervene between the Kērygma and Gregory Nazianzen. The difficulty of accounting for this change of name throws a doubt upon these two fragments, which has not yet been satisfactorily removed. They are surely older than Peter of Alexandria (+310), who for the rest

---

to us: 'Why do you still doubt and disbelieve? I am He that said to you, regarding my flesh, and death and resurrection, that you know I am He. You, Peter, put your finger in the nail wound in my hand; you, Thomas, put your finger in the lance wound in my side; and you, Andrew, touch my feet and see that you. . . . . We answered him: 'We have known in truth that . . . . in the flesh. . . . .'"

[1] Frag. XII. Orig. *Hom. X in Lev.* (Delarue, II, 246): "Sed est alia adhuc religiosa (scl. jejunandi ratio) cujus laus quorundam apostolorum letteris praedicatur: invenimus enim in quodam libello ab apostolis dictum: beatus est qui etiam jejunat pro eo ut alat pauperum. Hujus jejunium valde acceptum est apud Deum et revera digne satis; imitatur enim illum qui animum suam posuit pro fratribus suis."

Cf. *Pastor Hermae. Sim.* v. 3. 6; Aristides *Apol.* 15 (Syr.); Ep. Barn. 3:3; Tertul. *De jejun. adv. psych.* c. 13; Dob., pp. 84 and 135.

[2] Frag. XIII. Aptatus *De schism. Donat.* i. 5 (*M.P.L.*, XI, 895): "Cum in epistula Petri apostoli legimus: nolite per opinionem judicare fratres vestros." Dob., pp. 104 and 134.

[3] Frag. XIV. Greg. Naz. *Ep.* 20 *ad Caer. frat.* ii. 19: "for a weeping soul is near to God, says somewhere the wonderful Peter." Cf. *Orat.* 17. 5 (i. 321); Elias Cret. *M.P.G.*, 36. 395; Dob., p. 81, n. 1; Robinson, pp. 109 and 134.

[4] Frag. XV. Leontius Hiera (Lequien, II, 475, E. titl. 8 (V): R. fol. 167; litt. E. titl. 44; H. fol. 284, a. 1): "From the teachings of Peter: He is rich who has mercy on many and remembers that he has to give an account to God; for God gives all things to all men from His own riches. Understand that you are rich in order that you may be able to do good, taking freely of that which you possess. Remember what you have earned for yourself will be left to others; be careful of what belongs to others. Remember all things are equal before God, and no one will be poor." Cf. Greg. Naz. *Orat.* 14 (al. 16. ed. Maur., I, 274) Dob., pp. 110 and 134.

has no claim at all to them. Frag. XVI[1] lies under the same cloud as the two preceding fragments, and the difficulty is enhanced by the presence of "Alexandrias" after Peter's name. Hilgenfeld has ably defended the fragment against Dobschuetz, and shown that the word later crept into the manuscript. Whatever the difficulty be of explaining the change of *kērygma* into *didaskalia*, if it was but a change of title, it seems to the present writer evident that K.P. VIII lies behind this passage. Frag. XVII[2] is too brief to help us much in placing it where it belongs. It seems to have nothing in common with the K.P. but the name of "Blessed Peter," the commonest name in church history. Frag. XVIII[3] is surely related to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. What this "Pauli praedicatio" could be, is a mystery. In spite of Hilgenfeld's ingenious effort to identify it with our K.P., it is impossible for us to agree with him. The allusion to Peter and Paul in Rome is doubtless a tradition incorporated in some form in the many "Acts" of Peter or Paul. Frag. XIX[4] might link up fairly well with K.P. VI

[1] Frag. XVI. Leontius Hiera (Lequien, II, 336, Dob., p. 118): "Saint Peter of Alexandria's teachings: 'Miserable me! They have not learned that God sees the mind and hears the soul's voice. I confess my sins to myself saying: God is merciful, and I did not cease at all but all the more acknowledged my sins and prolonged my sacrifices to God.'"

[2] Frag. XVII. Oecom. *Com. ad Jacob.* v (op. II, 478): "And there is among you a saying of the blessed Peter: One (alone) living the community life and one (alone) living pure is useless and fruitless." Cf. Dob., pp. 118 and 134.

[3] Frag. XVIII. Pseudo-Cyp. *De rebapt.* 17 (Hortel, III, 90): "Est autem adulterini hujus, immo internecini baptismatis. Si qui alius auctor, tum etiam quidam ab eisdem ipsis haereticis propter hunc eundem errorem confictus liber, qui inscribitur *Pauli Praedicatio*, in quo libro contra omnes Scripturas et de peccato proprio confitentem invenies Christum, qui solus omnino nihil deliquit, et ad accipiendum Joannis baptisma quasi invitum a matre sua Maria esse compulsum, item cum baptizaretur, ignem super aquam esse visum, quod in evangelio nullo est scriptum et post tanta tempora Petrum et Paulum post conlationem evangelii in Hierusalom et mutuam cogitationem et altercationem et rerum agendarum disputationem postremo in Urbe quasi tunc primum invicem sibi esse cognitos et quaedam alia hujusmodi absurde ac turpiter conficta, quae omnia in illum librum invenies congesta." Cf. Dob., p. 157. Zahn (*G.K.*, II, 2. 2, p. 881) thinks this is from the Acts of Paul, with which he identifies the passage in Clem. *Strom.* vi. 5. 42. Cf. note 1, p. 76.

[4] Frag. XIX. Lactantius *Instit. div.* iv. 21: "Futura aperuit illis omnia quae Petrus et Paulus Roma praedicaverunt et ea praedicatio in memoriam scripta permansit, in qua sein multa alia mira, tum etiam futurum esse dixerunt ut post breve tempus immitteret Deus regem, qui expugnaret Iudaeos et civitates eorum solo adaequaret, ipsos autem fame sitique confectos obsideret; tum fore ut corporibus suorum vescerentur et consumerent se inviceus: postremo ut capti veniunt in manus hostium

or VII or IX. But the pretentious "omnia" and "multa alia mira," as well as the location "Romae" and the association of "Petrus et Paulus," make this "praedicatio in memoriam scripta" very different from our K.P., in the other extant fragments in which there is no allusion to "mira" or Rome. Possibly the name Paul slipped into one expression of Clement by sheer negligence, perhaps of a copyist, who was so used to writing the phase "as the apostle Paul says, "that he sleepily wrote it into this text (Dob., "Frag. XVIII"[1] (*Strom.* vi. 5. 42 f.). This and Dob., "Frag. XIX"[2] are so clearly connected with the others in context that it is only with arbitrary violence that they can be separated.

The Barlaam and Joasaph romance (see above), which was found to contain the *Apology* of Aristides, contains a number of passages which are strikingly similar to what is known of the K.P. Geffcken[3] calls our attention to several passages which are plainly not original with the writer of the romance. They are apologetic and may belong to the K.P., but the only apparent link is their proximity to Aristides' *Apology* and the general trend of the romance, which would make it likely that the writer would use the K.P., were it available, and he seems to have had access to other such material, and is so preoccupied with thought congenial with K.P. and Egyptian atmosphere that the a priori probability must be admitted in favor of identifying some of this B. J. apologetic material with our K.P. The romance begins thus: "The country called the land of the Indians is situated far from *Egypt.*" It then

---

et in conspectu suo vexari acerbissime conjuges suos cernerent, violari ac prostitui virgines, diripi pueros, allidi parvulos, omnia denique igni ferroque vastari, captivos in perpetuum terris suis exterminari eo quod exultaverint super amantissimum et probatissimum Dei filium." Cf. Dob., p. 131.

[1] Frag. XX. Clem. *Strom.* vi. 5. 42 ff. This passage should be read in the context. He has been quoting freely from the Preaching of Peter, and without any indication of interruption says: "The Apostle Paul declares in the Preaching of Peter: 'Take also the Greek books, read the *Sibyl*, that it may be clear there is one God and the future is coming to pass. Read also the *Hystaspes*, and you will find many brilliant and wise things concerning the Son of God, how many kings paid their respect to Christ, hating him and those bearing his name and those believing on him, and his patience and his appearance. Behold in one word you have it. All the world and all things in the world, are they not from One? Is He not God?' Therefore Peter says the Lord said to the apostles: 'If anyone therefore of Israel, being converted, will believe on God through my name, his sins shall be forgiven. But after twelve years,'" etc. Cf. Dob., p. 124. Hilgenfeld, *Z.W.T.*, I (1893), 525; Zahn, *G.N.T.K.*, II, 2, pp. 827 f.

[2] Frag. XXI. Dob., p. 126.

[3] Cf. Geffcken, *Zwei gr. Apol.*, pp. 82, 316.

describes the idolatry there, narrates its legendary conversion by the apostle Thomas, and in chapter v says: "Now when also in *Egypt* monasteries began to be founded and the multitude of monks increased" . . . . Christian monks went to India. There King Abenner was alarmed at the number of nobles who became monks, and issued a decree against Christianity. The story of his son's, Prince Joasaph's, conversion, is an adaptation of the life of Gautama Buddha. The monk Barlaam who converts the prince is the representative of Christianity and is made to utter, among other things, the argument which is recognized as the *Apology* of Aristides and other arguments which are here under consideration as possible K.P. fragments.

5. *Date.*—It is clear that Origen knew less than Clement about the K.P., and that Clement knew only what he learned from his sources, or *source*, for apparently he used only one, and this one was apparently the same as the Psalm-Commentary which is always quoted together with the K.P. This is plainly seen in the *Ecc. Proph.* 58 quotation (see the context). "Les Exc. et Ecl.," says Collomp (p. 39), "contiennent les extraits d'un livre dont l'aspect, le charactère sont tres définis et particulier; les Stromates ont utilise plusieurs fois ce livre—et les Homélies Clémentines connaissent une source indentique ou apparentée a lui." He shows (pp. 41–46) that, though the author of the book cannot now be learned, it was not Theodotus, nor Pantenus[1] nor probably any known author. Bousset[2] critically analyzing a similar passage of Clement, where he quotes the first Psalm, says: "Dies ganze Verfahren des Clemens findet nur dann seine Erklaerung, wenn wir annehmen duerfen, dass er an dieser Stelle eine ihm fertig vorliegende Erklaerung des ersten Psalms in den Zusammenhang einfuegt." At all events it seems reasonable to conclude that the Psalm-Commentary used by Clement was in writing, and that it had used our K.P. as a source, and that Clement quotes the K.P. passage in the Psalm-Commentary context, though the quotation takes him away from his immediate train of thought.

Clement was the first Christian writer of *literature*, in the sense that he is not forced to his task by the emergency of the moment, as Christian writers before him had been, but wrote for the writing's own sake,

[1] The authorship of this Psalm-Commentary is discussed by Collomp, pp. 141–46. He may be rather too positive in excluding the possibility of Pantenus. However, it is in any case a witness to the earlier existences of the Preaching, which it uses as a source.

[2] Cf. Bousset, p. 162.

to preserve material that else would have perished. In his effort thus to save from oblivion the store of "Schulgut" that had been handed down from several generations of Christian teachers, who were in turn but the heirs of earlier Jewish and Greek teachers and scholars, Clement made a storehouse of his *Stromateis*. Bousset (pp. 235 ff.) analyzes the sources of *Strom.* v. 20. 1–55, 4 as follows:

> 20, 3–21, 3 Aegypter; 21, 4–25, Hellener; 27, 1–31, 2 Pythagoraeer; 31, 3–5, Barbaren; 32–40 Altes Testament; 41–43 Aegypter; 45–50 Hellener (und Pythagoracer); 44–50 Barbaren; 51–54 Altes Testament. . . . . Jedenfalls hat auch dieser Abschnitt (v. 20–54) eine Geschichte hinter sich, die schliesslich bis in die juedische Apologetik zuruecklaeuft, ja darueber hinaus auf hellenistische (neupythagoraeischer) Quellen deutet, in denen das Thema der symbolischen Mysterienweisheit bei Griechen und Barbaren zuerst aufgetauscht sein wird.

Even granting, with Bousset (pp. 263 f.), that Clement had in great part used a source which can best be characterized as Gnostic, we may still maintain that this source used other earlier sources, some of which were not Gnostic, as Collomp has plainly shown, and among these was our K.P.

We arrive at a similar conclusion by following up Origen's reference to Heracleon, who lived in the middle of the second century. That the K.P. was older than his work is evident. Nor does it necessarily follow that all his sources were tainted with his Valentinian gnosis.

That Aristides used the K.P. is so universally admitted, and so evident, that reference need be made only to the discussion of Seeberg[1] and others. Furthermore, the date of Aristides,[2] whether 124, 129, or

[1] Cf. Geffcken, *Zwei gr. Apol.*, p. xxxi, and Seeberg, p. 216.

[2] The date of Aristides' *Apology* has been the subject of much discussion. The principal reasons for holding that it was addressed to Hadrian are the following: Eusebius (*H.E.* 4. 4) says: "Aristides . . . . left an apology for the faith which he addressed to Hadrian" (cf. also *Chron. ad A. Abr.* 2140). Eusebius certainly means Hadrian, about whom he is writing in both these places, and says: "Very many have this writing today." The Greek apology is addressed "Autokratori Kaisari Adrianōi." The Arminian Fragment "To the Emperor Caesar Hadrian." The only Syriac manuscript has two inscriptions, the first: "An apology which Aristides the philosopher made before Hadrian the king for the fear of God." The reasons for holding that it was addressed to Antoninus Pius are the second inscription of the Syriac manuscript: "To Emperor Caesar Titus (?) Hadrian Antoninus Sebastian Eusebius, Gratianus, Aristides Athenian philosopher," and misty allusions to a certain Athenian of Antonine's reign whom it is attempted to identify with the apologist. Hilgenfeld, *Z.W.T.*, I (1893), 539, n. 2, has accused J. Rendel Harris (*Apol. Aristides*, 1891) and Ed. Hennecke (Zahn, *For. G.N.T.K.*, I, 41–126) of inserting the name "Titus," for which there is no manuscript authority. Egli (*Z.T.W.* 36, I [1893], 100) calls attention to the

140, is a matter of only relative importance, for it seems quite as probable that the *Shepherd of Hermas*, a contemporary of Aristides, or even of earlier date, quoted the K.P.[1] There is much evidence that the K.P. was used by the epistle of Barnabas.[2] While the date of this epistle is disputed, there is much in favor of placing it in the reign of Nerva, which would throw the composition of K.P. in the first century.

---

interesting similarity of names and events in Asia Minor during the reign of Antonine with those mentioned by Eusebius under Hadrian (*H.E.* 4. 3 f.). During the proconsulate of "Statius Quadratus" in Asia Minor, an "Autokrator" was in Syria and the orator "Aelius Aristides," called the "Presbyter." Statius Quadratus was proconsul of Asia Minor, 154–55. Antoninus Pius was in Syria during that time. Marcianus is mentioned in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp*, which Egli dates February 23, 155 (*Z.W.T.* [1882], pp. 227 f.). Hence there is reason to suspect that Eusebius confused Antonine with Hadrian, and brought Aristides too near to Quadratus; unless, indeed, Quadratus the apologist be the same as Quadratus, bishop of Athens after the martyr Publius, about 140 A.D. (Euseb. *H.E.* 4. 23. 3), whom Jerome (*De vir.* iii. c. 19, 4 *Ep.* 70, *Magn.* c. 4) identifies with the apologist. In this case the apologies of both Quadratus and Aristides would fall in the reign of Antonine. This depends, however, on a confusion, and if there is confusion anywhere it is quite reasonable to suspect that the long title of the Syriac manuscript of Aristides' *Apology* has been confused with Justin's. Compare the two. This is all the more probable inasmuch as it is contradicted by the Greek and Armenian and even the first Syriac title.

[1] The *Shepherd of Hermas* was probably written not all at one time, but is rather a collection of visions and meditations for some time before 150 A.D. The Muratorian Fragment says: "Pastorem vero nuperrime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Hermas conscripsit, sedente (in) cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo fratre ejus." Cf. Bard., *G.A.R.*, I, 557 ff. For the text see F. X. Funk, *Die apostolischen Vaeter*[2] (1906), pp. 144 ff. Seeberg (Zahn, *For. G.N.T.K.*, V, 216) and Zahn (*G.N.T.K.*, II, 831; I, 920) think the K.P. was used by the author of the *Shepherd*. See also Hilg., *N.T. extra canonen Recept.*, IV; Dob., p. 67: "mit dem Hirten des Hermas . . . . mannigfacher Anklaenge. . . . . In einigen Punkten duerfte das K.P. alter sein als der Hirt."

[2] The so-called Epistle of Barnabas is dated by Harnack 130–31 A.D. on account of chap. 16: "The temple is destroyed by enemies; now the servants of the enemy themselves will rebuild it"; which he thinks refers to the destruction and rebuilding of the Jerusalem Temple during the Jewish war of that date. Funk understands the passage in chap. 16 to refer to the destruction of the Temple by Titus, and the rebuilding to refer to a "Spiritual temple," 16: 10, which is plain from the context. The entire Epistle is far-fetched allegory. In 4:4–5, there is a mystic interpretation of Dan. 7:8, 24, applying the prophecy to the "eleventh king," who will "humble three at one time," whom Hilgenfeld and Funk take to mean Nerva (96–98). Cf. Bard., *G.A.K.*, I, 87 ff., and literature there given. Harnack, *G.A.L.*, II, 1, 140 ff; Funk, *Kirchengeschichte, Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen*, II, 77 ff. The text used in this dissertation is Funk's. Dob., p. 67, says the K.P. "ist allem anschein nach spaeter als der gleichfalls Alexandrinischen Barnabas Brief, der freilich wohl in sehr fruehe Zeit (unter Vespasian?) anzusetzen ist."

The Fragments themselves contain nothing which would require a later date than 100 A.D. Indeed it is difficult to place their contents later than 100 A.D. There is no mention of ecclesiastical organization, or developed liturgy. Only "the twelve disciples, chosen apostles" appear. The "twelve years" of Jewish mission preceding the gentile mission, which has gone "into the whole world," indicates a date when Christianity had begun to spread around the Mediterranean, and doubtless Jerusalem had been destroyed and the Jewish national hope had fallen, and the conversion of the Jews despaired of, and the Christian stood out as a "third race," distinct alike from Jew and Greek. Baptism is not mentioned as an essential for becoming a Christian, and there is no thought of the Holy Ghost; from which it is reasonable to infer that neither the Johannine controversy nor the "Pneumatic" movement, if so we might designate that which is so prominent in the Acts of the Apostles, had yet reached the regions where the K.P. was written. Where was this?

6. *Place.*—There were in Egypt about this time not less than a million Jews, more than in all Palestine. The K.P. was written where Jews were apparently as prominent as Greeks. The idolatry it opposes is typically Egyptian. The language it uses was certainly familiar in Egypt, if not characteristically Alexandrine. The Petrine tradition was shifting from Rome to Alexandria—or was the shifting in the opposite direction? Were Hebrews and I Peter written from Alexandria? It was there, doubtless, that the *Sibyl*[1] sang of Rome as "Babylon." It was at Alexandria that the K.P. was quoted by the only three writers who may have known it at first hand or with certainty: Heracleon, Clement, and Origen. Probably, then, the place of the writing of the K.P. was Alexandria.

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing study it seems reasonable to conclude that the Preaching of Peter is not an anti-Jewish polemic, as Garbe thought; nor a Judaeo-Christian Gnostic work, as Mayerhoff claimed; nor a remnant of The Preaching of Peter and Paul, if such a work ever existed, as Hilgenfeld contended; nor merely a "half-apologetic," as Harnack and Dobschuetz described it; but even more than Geffcken considered it, a forerunner, as it were, of the apologies, though not directly used by them. It is a Christian apology in the true sense of the word—an

[1] Cf. *Sibyl*, V, 143, 159; Geffcken, *Zwei gr. Apol.*, p. 111; Apoc. 17:5; 18:10; Case, *The Revelation of John*, 1919, on these passages.

apology rather than a polemic, not defending Christianity against hostile adversaries, but calmly reasoning with an audience which, though not yet Christian, was willing to lend an unprejudiced ear to what Christianity had to say for itself; an audience in which the Jewish element was quite as prominent as the Hellenic, yet not Jewish of the Pharisaic or rabbinic sort, nor Hellenic so preoccupied with mythology as Aristides, Justin, Tatian, and Athenagoras addressed; but rather a Jewish-Hellenistic audience of the Alexandrine type, prepared for something better than animal or angel worship, inclined to believe in one God who created and governs all things for man's sake, who forgives sin committed in ignorance if the offender prepares his heart by repentance; an audience reaching out after God and seeking salvation, such as the Preaching promised. Such an audience there was in Egypt in the first Christian century, such preaching was being done there by men like Apollos and the writer of the Epistle of Barnabas. The name, probably later attached to the Preaching, reveals its relation to the Petrine literature, that literature which began to appear, probably, in Domitian's reign, if not earlier; appealing to the authority of the Prince of the Apostles; affixing that authority to the Roman church through the medium of Peter's death and Mark's work and presence there; producing a Gospel in Mark's name and Peter's authority, the Epistles to the Hebrews, I Peter (later so-called), and (Clement) I Corinthians; collecting the stories which supplied material for Acts, chapters 1–12.

The Apocalypse of Peter was embodied in this collection of Petrine Literature, and II Peter appeared to claim I Peter, the Apocalypse, and Preaching, and to promulgate the Gospel or Acts of Peter.

Thus was Christian apologetic propitiously born at Alexandria, toward the end of the first century A.D., of Jewish and Christian parents, and was given the name of the chief of Christian apostles. Growing up in the Graeco-Roman world, struggling with every type of opponent, it contributed much toward the evolution of Christian theology, itself being the product of struggle and the embodiment and vigorous outgrowth of the strongest and healthiest flesh and blood of the philosophies and religions of generations past.

INDEX

Angels, Jewish worship of, 25, 28
Apologetic, beginning of Christian, 47 f.; difference between, and genetic literature, 56 f.
Apostle, 1, 34 f.
Aristides, K.P. in *Apology* of, 3, 78

Barlaam and Joasaph romance, 3, 76
Barnabas, Epistle of, 79 f.
Bousset, W., on relation of Jewish and Christian apologetic, 7, 77 f.

Case, S. J., hypothesis, 69 f.
Clement, Alex., fragments of K.P. *apud*, 1, 2
Clementina, 44, 71, 73
Clementine, homilies and recognitions, 43, 72 f.
Collomp, on clement's sources, 7, 77 f.
Corinthians, First Epistle to (of Clement), 63 f.
Cyprian (pseudo), *De rebapti.* fragment, 75

Didaskalia, 75
Dobschuetz, E. von, on K.P., 5 ff.
"Doctrina Petri," 74
Dodwell, on K.P., 4

Faith, 26 f., 36 f., 42, 50 f.
Feasts and fasts, 1, 28
Friedlaender, Moriz, on the relation of Jewish and Christian apologetic, 48

Geffcken, J., on the origin of Christian apologetic, 7
God, "One God," 16, 21. *See* Trinity
"Gods," idol and animal worship, 21, 25
Gregory, Naz., fragments *apud*, 74

Harnack, A., on K.P., 5
Hebrews, 63 f.
Hermetic literature, its influence on Christian, 14 f.
Hilgenfeld, on K.P., 4

Jewish worship, 25 f.
Josephus, 53 f.

Kērygma, defined, 60
"Kerygmata," of Peter, 71

Lactantius, fragment *apud*, 75
Law, in Greek and Jewish philosophy, 8; in New Testament, 10; in Philo, 11; in Justin, 25
Law, Jewish, regard for among Romans, 9 f.
Leontius, Hiera, 74 f.
Logos, in Greek and Jewish philosophy, 8–16; in New Testament, 15

Mark, 67 f.

New, "third race of Christians," 2, 29 f.

Oecomenius, 75
Optatus, "Epistola Petri" *apud*, 74
Origen, fragments of K.P. *apud*, 3, 74

Pantenus, 77
"Parousia," 3, 38, 42
"Person" (Prosōpon), 28
Peter, Acts of, 43; Epistles of, 43, 64 f., Gospel of, 43, 61; Apocalypse of, 44
Peter, Alex., 74
Petrine literature, 42, 62 f.
Philo, Alex., "Law" and "Logos" *apud*, 8; apologetic, 54 f.
Praedicatio, Petri, 73 f.
Preaching. *See* Kerygma
Prophecy, fulfilled in Jesus, 39
Prophets, "Logos" *apud*, 9

"Repentance," 3, 25, 29, 32 f., 50 f.
Robinson, J. A., on K.P., 5
Roman church, 51 f.

"Sabbath," which is called "First," 29
"Scripture," 3, 36 f.
Shepherd of Hermas, 79
Sibyl "Law" *apud*, 10
Sin, forgiveness of, 3, 25, 32 f.

Trinity, 15, 28. *See* God
"Twelve years," stay of the apostles in Jerusalem, 33 f., 69

Wendland, P., on the Therapeutae, 7

Zahn, Theodor, on K.P., 5

621

WEISE-WINCKLER BIND
JUL 1949
ANTI..

DATE DUE

08

BS 2960 .P6 R42 1923

Reagan, Joseph Nicholas.

The preaching of Peter:

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS2545.P6 R42 1973
Reagan, Joseph The preaching of Peter
3 0645 0004 9183 3